

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 104, NO. 22

NEW YORK, MONDAY, JUNE 2, 1941

NUMBER 1383

The President Meets the Challenge

THE PRESIDENT'S RADIO SPEECH is undoubtedly one of the most important utterances in the history of this country. On previous occasions he has challenged the fascist dictatorships; but never has he defied them in such terms as these. His words almost certainly mean fighting within a few weeks or months, depending upon Hitler's readiness to accept the challenge. The editors of The New Republic believe profoundly that it is a wiser national course to use force of arms now and keep Britain in the war than to abstain a little longer and be compelled to fight alone against a fascist-dominated world.

The President has now made it clear that he shares this belief. In declaring an unlimited national emergency he has pledged the full strength of the United States navy and other forces to ensure the delivery of American-made war materials to Great Britain. He goes beyond the mere matter of convoys for merchant ships to the use of every method and combination of methods that are required. American technicians are now at work on this problem. We will not tolerate Hitler's armed forces in any position from which they can threaten any part of this hemisphere, whether it be from Dakar, the Azores or the Cape Verde Islands. The pledge of protection from aggression that we have given Canada is now extended to all the American republics. Defiance of the Nazis, their philosophy and their armed might, could hardly go any farther.

In support of this move, which is admittedly one of national danger, the President makes stern demands

upon the American people. Neither capital nor labor will be permitted to take advantage of this profound national emergency for selfish purposes of its own. Wars between them or within either of their camps cannot be permitted to threaten the flow of supplies for our defense and that of Britain. We must be prepared to make deep sacrifices on behalf of democracy, to show that we have more than a surface affection for our way of life.

It would be easy of course to accompany this speech by the one the President might have made as a supplement to it. He could have said much more and been much franker about where our defense effort stands. He could have given more definite guarantees that the muddle, confusion and cross purposes that have existed in Washington for the past year will be ameliorated. Many of his listeners would have been glad to learn that those elements in the government, and especially in the State Department, that still want appeasement will be forced to live up to the policy of the chief executive. But these details seem less important at the moment than the essential central fact. That fact is that the President has set our feet upon a path from which there can be no turning back. He has answered the Nazi challenge to the validity of the democratic way of life with an affirmation of our belief in freedom and with the determination that no sacrifice is too great to secure it. The prospect of war is a terrible one; but the prospect of a world dominated by Nazidom, with every value of civilization destroyed, is more terrible still.

CONTENTS

The Week 743

Editorials

Britain in Peril 746
Can the War Be Won? 747
Save the WPA 748
Southern Gentlemen Preferred 749

General Articles

Armaments and Security . . . Julian Huxley 750
Blacklist in Action . . . Willson Whitman 752
Tax Excess Profits! Max Gissen 755
Shirts That Shrink Michael Straight 757
Washington Notes T. R. B. 758

To Paint What Then I Saw . . . Stark Young 759
Citizen Welles Otis Ferguson 760
The Bandwagon 761
A Communication Leo Huberman 762

Correspondence 763

The Means of Grace W. H. Auden 765

Books in Review

Punishment and Crime . . . Malcolm Cowley 766
Medicine for the Million . . . Harry M. Davis 767
Refugees—Screen Version . . . Klaus Lambrecht 768
Animal Kingdom . . . J. R. De La Torre Bueno Jr. 768
Hands in Imperfect Order . . . Harry Brown 769
A Reader's List 770

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1941, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

The Answer

For weeks early in the war, the Germans asked in derision, "Where is the Ark Royal?" They claimed they had sunk the great aircraft carrier, in spite of British denials. On Tuesday morning, May 27, they had the answer to their question. The Ark Royal was on the tail of the Bismarck in the Atlantic. A torpedo from a plane which was housed on the British carrier so wounded the greatest German battleship that she could no longer escape her pursuers. After being pounded by heavy shells from the Prince of Wales, the Bismarck finally was dispatched by another torpedo from an Ark Royal plane.

Civilian Defense

For the appointment of the dynamic Mayor of New York to head civilian defense we have nothing but praise. Unlikely as any bombing of our cities may seem, advance preparations for it are as necessary as any phase of military training. There is much to organize and much to learn before the possibility of any such misfortune arises. In many other fields also, present-day war calls for as much preparation by civilians as by the military. Even concerning defense against possible invasion—improbable as invasion may be—Tom Wintringham wrote in *The New Republic* of May 12 an excellent commentary on the national value of an armed citizenry.

Many who have been considering civilian defense have been talking of it as an outlet for the unused emotions of a population which wants to participate and is frustrated by inability to do so. No doubt such an outlet is needed. But if the activities of the new agency were to be conceived only in this way, we should be in for a really meaningless type of boondoggling which would not satisfy even its participants. There are real jobs for civilian defense, and care should be taken that they are organized. Besides preparation for possible attack, how about organizing consumers to watch prices and make the best use of available commodities? How about the hundred and one other activities on the home front which directly concern the welfare of the people? If Mr. LaGuardia really tackles the whole job, he may not be able to be active as mayor, though we shall miss him if he does not have a third term.

It's Not Over at Dearborn

Long after Henry Ford had begun twisting and turning in every possible effort to avoid obeying the National Labor Relations Act, the Ford employees at Dearborn have voted overwhelmingly to designate the CIO as their bargaining agent; most of the minority chose the AFL and only a handful wanted no union at all. Thus ignominiously Ford is repudiated in his time-worn contention that his employees are so well treated that they do not need or want a union.

Will he accept this ultimate verdict? We hope so, but we are far from confident. Weeks ago, Harry Bennett, the Ford personnel manager, declared that the management would obey the law if it had to, by holding an election and bargaining with the union, but that it would "bargain until Hell freezes over." This can only mean that he did not intend to reach any agreement or sign any contract. The law says that the employer must bargain "in good faith." The proceedings from now on will show whether the many evidences of bad faith which the Ford management has evinced in the past will continue. The burden of proof is 100 percent on Mr. Ford.

America First and the Left

The big Madison Square Garden rally of the America First Committee followed the now routine pattern, including the usual minor fracas over the Christian Front elements in the audience who embarrassed John T. Flynn, the chairman of the meeting. One new factor, however, was added—the presence on the platform as a speaker of Norman Thomas. Although he stayed clear of the Popular Front several years ago, Mr. Thomas has now united himself with a very different collection of elements, not on the Left but chiefly on the Right. This new united front of men like Mr. Thomas and Mr. Flynn with the Lindberghs, the General Woods, the Father Currans of the America First Committee is the sheerest folly from any standpoint of democratic survival in America. We are aware that politics makes strange bedfellows on both sides of the argument. We understand the sincerity as well as the intensity of the opposition on the Left to American entrance into the war. But the America First Committee, is the most powerful single potential fascist group in this country today—the group that is polarizing every fascist force among us. It knows much better where it is going than innocents like Messrs. Thomas and Flynn. To coöperate with them is the formula for suicide, not only for the Left but for the country as a whole.

General Wood Speaks

What does the America First Committee, which has been talking mainly in negative terms of what we should not do, really propose that we do? This question was put by Kenneth Crawford of PM to General Wood, the head of the committee, in a remarkable interview. Wood's answer contained some curious revelations. One was that he was willing to let the Nazis have the southern half of Latin America, everything "below the bulge." That is an interesting addition to the Monroe Doctrine; interesting, too, as revealing an imperialist willingness to divide Latin America into spheres of influence; interesting finally in its naïve assumption that the Nazis would stay put in the southern half without penetrating into the other half and even-

tually into America. Another remark worth noting was that while Wood denied that the committee was anti-Semitic, he warned the Jews that they should not all be found on one side, but should distribute themselves on both sides of the war question as do the Gentiles. Doesn't General Wood see that once you begin telling the Jews that they had better act thus and thus or else, you have adopted the essence of the Nazi mentality toward them?

FDR Said a Mouthful

Here is something to paste in your hat. They are some of the most important words a President of the United States has ever uttered. They are part of the President's message to the National Nutrition Conference for Defense.

"Medical authorities recognize completely that efficiency and stamina depend on proper food. . . . Every survey of nutrition, by whatever methods conducted, shows that here in the United States undernourishment is widespread and serious. . . . We do not lack, as we will not lack, the means of producing food in abundance and variety. Our task is to translate this advice into reality for every American family."

Persistent reports have it that the Nazis have slyly extracted vital ingredients from the foods of subject peoples in an effort to undermine their vigor and courage. If this is true, they are making nutrition work two ways for them, because everyone who is useful to them at home is carefully and scientifically nourished. If Hitler has anything like a master race, he got it in the laboratory and the granary. We know just as much about food as the Nazis do, and instead of a scarcity we have a superabundance of it. But we have not yet achieved the Nazis' genius for translating knowledge into action.

The West Coast Strike

The strike of the machinists at San Francisco has stirred up again violent anti-labor bias which we had hoped the good work of the Mediation Board had silenced. Unfortunate as the stoppage is, and confused as the issues are, the strike has been handled by the authorities in the worst possible fashion. First it was branded by the press and the Navy Department as a "wildcat strike." It is true that John P. Frey and William Green, who have in the past disclaimed any responsibility for the action of AFL affiliates, have opposed the strike, but it was called in compliance with union laws and with the full support of the International Association of Machinists. It is not true that the strike violated an existing agreement. The Bethlehem company was not a party to the master agreement signed in April, and the repair shop over which the controversy is centered was specifically exempt from that agreement.

On May 17, James Forrestal, Acting Secretary of the

Navy, denounced the strike and hinted that the navy was prepared to break it by the use of troops. Frey at the same time led a group of non-striking crafts through the picket line. On May 25 the Truman Commission opened hearings on the strike.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bard, who had been a Chicago investment banker with no experience in labor relations, asserted that it was "instigated by selfish and subversive elements." He suggested that the leaders might be prosecuted by the Justice Department for conspiracy against the defense effort. Rear Admiral Land, chairman of the Maritime Commission, who is notorious for his opposition to labor, was even more extreme. He suggested that troops be used to break up the picket line and to lead the strikers back to work.

The leaders of Local 29 were later told to appear in Washington. They were prevented from testifying while Frey and Mayor Rossi of San Francisco made personal attacks upon them as friends of Harry Bridges. On Monday the leaders of Local 29 were to testify; but when Green was unable to appear the hearings were postponed and the leaders were kept in Washington during a vital part of the San Francisco negotiations. We submit that this is not the way to allay workers' hostility to employers or suspicion of government officials who talk of patriotism in industrial disputes.

News Notes of a Week

Reversing a twenty-year-old decision, the Supreme Court voted 4 to 3 that Congress has power to regulate primary elections. The ruling might mean the end of the poll tax and drastic change in the system of nominating presidential candidates by the present party conventions. . . . FDR signed the 85-percent-parity farm-loan bill. . . . The Federal Trade Commission ordered Hearst Magazines, Inc., "to cease and desist from misrepresentations" in connection with the "seal of approval" issued by Good Housekeeping. The end of a long battle. . . . Leon Henderson set a ceiling on cotton-yarn prices 20 percent below current prices, but far above costs. "What is left of our democracy?" mourned "Cotton Ed" Smith, South Carolina Senator. . . . Colleges will offer a three-year course next fall, to enable students to graduate before being called for military service.

Pierre Laval told a New York Times reporter that he gained Hitler's confidence because he too "spoke the language of the new Europe." But some Frenchmen still admire French. . . . A Franco decree gave the Falange Party complete control of press, radio and moving pictures. For propaganda against the United States and Britain? . . . The British forces, nearing Bagdad, seemed to be getting the upper hand in Irak. . . . Through a Tokyo newspaper, Admiral Raeder of Germany warned that any naval aid to Great Britain by the United States would be a plain act of war. Note FDR's reply, page 743, this issue.

Britain in Peril

WHEN SPRING BEGAN, most Americans looked forward partly with dread, but partly also with hope, to an attempted Nazi invasion of Britain. This, they knew, would be the critical six months of the war. Hitler had promised his countrymen a quick victory. He not only must retain their confidence, but he would have to win promptly if he were to act before American war production got into full stride. Therefore, it was reasoned, he would take the gamble as soon as weather permitted. While the risk to the Allied cause was great, we could not help feeling confident that the British would repulse the invader. After such a failure, the Nazis would never again have so good a chance. Gradually the Allies would be able to capitalize on the gains they had made during the winter in Africa and the Mediterranean area, and Hitler's star would begin to set.

This expectation has proved to be too simple. From the point of view of a prompt test and a decisive outcome, the war has been going very badly. Hitler struck, not by an attempted invasion of the British Isles, but in the Balkans and Africa. With overwhelming force and amazing speed, he conquered Yugoslavia and Greece, throwing all armed resistance out of the continent of Europe, and retrieved General Wavell's brilliant conquest of Libya. Turkey was successfully neutralized; Russia brought closer to the Axis. France and Spain are rapidly being "coördinated." The fighting shifted toward Suez with the hostilities in Irak and the German air penetration of Syria. Crete, one of Britain's strongholds that stood in the way of all-out invasion of the Middle East, was invested by hordes from the air, and though its fate is still in doubt as we write, the RAF has been forced to retire from the island and the utmost efforts of the British navy have not prevented the landing of troops by sea. Indeed, the Axis claims to have put the Mediterranean fleet out of action by dive-bombers and small craft, having sunk in a week twenty-five warships, including eleven cruisers. The British deny this, but admit the loss of two cruisers and four destroyers—more than they can afford—and acknowledge damage to two battleships and several other cruisers.

Meanwhile Hitler has pressed the assault on Britain closer home in the Battle of the Atlantic and the air. His raiders have sunk an alarming quantity of merchantmen, while he has made a shambles of port after port. Finally he has sunk one of the great capital ships of the British navy in a straight-out sea battle, almost within the line of the Western Hemisphere.

It is possible to find consolation in all these events. The Germans, according to Allied reports, have lost heavily in men and aircraft. The Hood was an old ship; the Bismarck, which destroyed her, was later sent

to the bottom; the British have four new battleships at least as powerful as she, and altogether retain fifteen capital ships to Germany's two or three. RAF raids over Germany and occupied territory have increased in scope and intensity. American help, though too slow to be of great immediate use, is coming faster than was expected a few months ago. Nevertheless wars are not fought for consolation prizes. The plain fact is that German military power has so far been victorious in everything it has seriously attempted, and that as far as anyone can see on the surface it retains its superiority over the British in the air and on the land, while it is working with some success toward neutralizing British supremacy at sea.

The ugly aspect of the situation is that Hitler evidently intends to take no desperate chance which would provide his enemy a good opportunity for an ultimately decisive victory. We might have expected this caution from his former record. But at the same time he is coming ever closer to the ability to invest and conquer Britain without incurring much risk of defeat. His diversion in the East has apparently not sapped his strength for this purpose, but on the contrary has cost the British heavily in prestige and machines of war, and something at least in manpower. German thoroughness and careful calculation are slowly drawing the net tighter, and it is far from impossible that Hitler will still try the final blow at Britain before next winter. If he does, we face the grim probability that he will have made almost certain of success before he starts.

If it is crucial for the United States that Britain stand, Americans must ask themselves what they may do to turn the tide before it is too late. The New Republic has hoped, successively, that it would be sufficient to end the arms embargo, to facilitate British purchasing, to pass the lease-lend bill and to establish the broader naval patrol. It has joined with those who have urged every expedient to push munitions production. The question used to be asked, beyond this, what can we do as long as we are not fully armed? But the rhetorical query always involved one basic assumption—that British control of the seas remained unassailable. That assumption is no longer valid. And the United States is ready with sea power—a navy as powerful and efficient as any in the world. If it were thrown into action now, with its well trained air arm, we could be almost certain of turning Hitler back in the Battle of the Atlantic, and perhaps in the Mediterranean as well. This is what he fears most, as the warning from Admiral Raeder testifies, and what he has been using Japanese threats to prevent. With sufficient resolution and courage we could ensure that Britain would not be invaded at all. That would nail down the defense of this country. Why play further cat and mouse with the problem, instead of employing the sound strategy of the offensive? This is our hour of decision.

Can the War Be Won?

THESE ARE THE DAYS in which the Nazi war lords are unleashing everything they have. And not only against Britain. Against America as well. If diplomacy is the technique of seeking to influence a nation's foreign policy, America is now being made the principal objective of a diplomatic offensive by the Nazis. The war in Crete, the sinking of the Hood, the Tokyo statement of Admiral Raeder have all obviously combined to lend point to the Lindbergh thesis that the war is already lost and that America had better throw in the sponge before she even starts. Since the Nazis are spelling out this diplomatic offensive mainly with planes, tanks and cruisers, they add a new ironic truth to Clausewitz's famous dictum that war is merely the continuation of diplomacy by other means.

Is it true that the war cannot be won? The answer is that without America's entrance into the war, only a major miracle could keep the Nazis from a complete victory. With America's entrance, however, the story is a very different one.

It has become clear by now that this is not a war that will be determined by the struggle of interlocked land armies. It is a war, first, of new and revolutionary machines—swift and heavily armed machines in the air, ever more powerful machines on the sea, monster tank-machines on land. In terms of manpower, it is a war of those who can run and man those machines. It is a war, second, of factories and materials, to make and feed these machines. This means that the nation that has the greatest industrial power and raw-material resources, and that can energize that power and those resources at the point of military action, must in the long run have the edge in the war. Third, it is a war of morale, of the endurance of civilian populations while they suffer extremes of privation, sacrifice, bombardment and the fear of all of them.

In this long-range war the Nazis have the jump on the democracies on the score of war-machines. They have taken eight years to prepare a ganglion of war mechanisms which we shall have at the best two or three years to produce. Fortunately this margin is not so decisive as it sounds because of the obsolescence rate of the machines. The Nazis are having to build new machines to keep their edge over the British and us, rather than relying on their old. There can be little doubt that in two years the combined British and American industrial power will have overtaken the Nazis in the war of machines.

This, of course, is on the assumption that we can muster our full industrial power, and that the British are not knocked out of the war in that period. There are many in this country who think both assumptions are untenable. Yet Hitler himself, as indicated by his anxiety to keep America out of the war, evidently thinks differently. The potential industrial power of

America for armaments is enormous—still, despite all the gains the Nazis have made, the greatest in the world. We must not forget that. In a year, the experts tell us, we shall have a formidable array of machines and armed forces. But somehow we must win that year for ourselves, and we can do it only by joining with the British now. We have a navy today which is not being used and which could be used to good effect. Under the stimulus of actual warfare we could also spur our war production. We must join the British while they still have their massive power intact to which we can join ours. Paradoxical as it may seem, we must throw in all our resources now in order to gain time to develop our potential war resources to the full.

If we can do this, we probably do not need to think in terms of a large American expeditionary force. If the British, with complete American naval and shipping aid, can win the Battle of the Atlantic, they can keep Britain in the war indefinitely no matter what happens in the Mediterranean and the Near East; and they can also blockade Germany and keep out some of her essential war materials. The German war machine needs far more ferrous and non-ferrous metals than it has; it needs far more high-test gas and lubricants. Even the Irak wells would not solve the German problem so long as the Nazis do not have and cannot easily build tankers to transport the oil and refineries to process it.

And, more important, if the British with American aid can in time build enough bombers and fighters to capture control of the air, they can subject the Nazi industrial centers on the Continent to a bombardment even more severe than the British cities have been subjected to. They can thus paralyze the very nerve-centers of the Nazi war effort. This, along with the blockade of essential war materials and the incapacity of Nazi-held Europe to feed itself, should prove the turning-point of the war. And there can be little doubt that the morale of the Nazis will not endure this test as has British morale.

After that the job will have to be completed not by America or even by the British, but by two other sets of combatants. We refer first to peoples of Nazi-held Europe. Hitler has not given them a new order of any sort. He has combined economic and military coercion with boundary-juggling, which indicates that even he has not learned the lesson of Versailles. Despite his systematic campaign of extermination, transplantation and indoctrination, the seeds of rebellion are there more than ever. When the war begins to turn against the Nazis, that rebellion will flower.

The other factor that can be counted on to finish the war is the potential energy of disintegration within Germany. Last week we commented in these terms on the meaning of Hess's flight to Britain. The Nazi administrative machine is a good one in victory. It will not stand the shock of defeats. But here too, as with

the rebellion-potential of the conquered nations, this disintegration-potential will not operate by itself. It will do so only when the combined power of America and Britain has begun to turn the tide of the battle of war machines, factories and morale against the Nazis.

Save the WPA

IF IT WEREN'T PLAGIARISM of all the cities that have campaigned for their orchestras, we should say that this was a good time to save our sympathy. During the depression we developed something remotely like a national grace and a gentler heart, perhaps because we had plenty of time to realize that most of us were either in the same boat or could easily get there. Now that we are becoming busy and ruthless again and the manna is falling thickest among the choicest of God's chosen investors, it would be good for us to remember that although individually the race may go to the swift and the strong, democratic progress is a convoy paced to its slowest members. Because it would become us, and also for the most selfish reasons in the world, we must readmit all of America to the Union. A good way to start is to save the WPA.

There is good support for the thesis that the President's request for \$875,000,000 for WPA in 1941-42 will be about half enough. That amount will employ only 1,000,000 persons, although there are 2,800,000 families eligible. The average employed in the current fiscal year will be about 1,700,000, which is itself the lowest in WPA history. On May 14 the number had been brought down to 1,497,000. Under the \$1,381,000,000 appropriation for 1940-41, this will be cut sharply to 1,300,000 by the end of June. Under the proposed appropriation, a further reduction of 300,000 would have to be made during July.

But this suggested cut is based on the premise that greatly increased defense production will reduce unemployment. This is true, of course. The critical test, however, is *how much* unemployment will be reduced.

The best information indicates that 2,800,000 persons will be absorbed in industry and the armed forces during the next fiscal year. The services in this estimate are allowed 300,000 additional men, while an estimated increase in the national income of \$8,000,000,000 to \$10,000,000,000 would provide about 2,500,000 jobs. This is a huge increase. Those who expect more than that perhaps ignore one or several of these factors: (1) some key industries have long been at capacity; (2) the forthcoming increase in armament production will to a great extent come at the expense of consumer production; thus the level of output, which determines the volume of employment, will not be raised proportionately; priorities, of course, help to freeze the production level; the failure of either industry or government to undertake the necessary radical increases in plant capacity indicates that this philosophy of relative

scarcity will be continued; (3) bottlenecks have already developed not only in plants, but in certain skills and raw materials; (4) the rate of expansion must slow down as idle plants are utilized and armament increases come only by plant conversion, which causes time-consuming adjustments, and with the going into production of new plants, which will increase the production level only by fits and starts; (5) increased productivity (31 percent in manufacturing, 40 percent in railroads, 76 in electric power and 29 in mining between 1929 and 1939) will cause employment to lag behind production gains.

If the labor supply increases by 1,600,000, which would allow for 1,000,000 students and women, surplus agricultural workers and some of the self-employed, as well as a 600,000 normal net increase in the labor supply, unemployment will have declined by 1,200,000. Certainly 1,500,000 is a liberal estimate. On that basis, unemployment in 1941-42 will average between 5,500,000 and 7,500,000, depending upon whether you start with National Industrial Conference Board or CIO figures.

What percentage of these must the WPA employ? During the fiscal years 1937-41, the WPA took care of 29 percent of the unemployed (NICB figures). For this year, the rate will be less than 25 percent. But on the basis of the \$875,000,000 recommended by the President, this would be reduced to only 20 percent in 1941-42. Since the savings of most of these people are longer exhausted, since they are probably older, more discouraged, longer undernourished and more thoroughly sifted by private employers and found wanting; since, furthermore, there is no good prospect of private employment making them useful, we must assume that the President bases his figure either upon facts not in the possession of ordinary economists and political scientists or upon matters extraneous to the welfare of these people. If we did no more than meet the same proportion of the need that is being met this year, the minimum appropriation would have to be \$1,150,000,000.

We think there are several reasons why more than this should be provided. One is that maldistribution of defense contracts has left the unemployment situation extremely critical in certain localities. Sixty-nine percent of the defense contracts awarded through March have gone to twenty industrial areas containing only 28 percent of the population and 24 percent of WPA employment. It will not be possible to withdraw from these most-favored regions enough money to take care of the least favored. A second reason is this: We have a great job to do in the United States. It will require three things the WPA can provide: (1) organization; (2) a civilian labor force; (3) morale. The WPA has not only been the largest employer of labor, but one of the most efficient. It has taken broken, dispirited men and with them built some of the great bridges, parks and hospitals of the world. It has gone

through the wildest fluctuations in appropriations and labor force in an orderly manner. It has operated through the whole pyramid of political pressures and come off with dignity and a clean shirt. It has worked not only in the glare but in the heat of publicity in the most adverse circumstances, and all its scandals have been little ones and its crimes somewhat below ordinary incidence. Such an organization must not be crippled. Instead, it must be put to work building the morale and the bridges, highways and airports we need for the national defense.

Southern Gentlemen Preferred

FOR THE SECOND TIME within six months, death has dramatized with disturbing clarity a problem which has haunted the New Deal from its earliest days—the effects of the seniority rule on the leadership of Congress in a Democratic administration.

Last fall the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, left vacant by the death of Senator Key Pittman, went by the rule of seniority to Senator Walter F. George of Georgia, one of the Senators whom the President had sought to purge in the campaign of 1938. By the same rule, chairmanship of the Committee on Military Affairs has now been handed over to Senator Robert Reynolds of North Carolina, described by the careful New York Times as “a man completely out of sympathy with his party majority, the congressional majority, the administration and the expressed public opinion of the country on the subject of national defense.”

Under the unwritten rule of seniority, the chairmanship of each committee in Congress is given to the member of the majority party who has the longest *unbroken* record of service on the committee. A new member, no matter what his qualifications, must begin at the bottom of the list, with promotion depending upon the physical or political death of someone who arrived earlier. A single defeat sends him back to the bottom of the list, no matter how long his previous service.

This subordination of all other qualifications to the length of uninterrupted service has given to the “solid South” a dominating position during Democratic administrations out of all proportion to its population and geographic importance.

The reasons for this are obvious. Due to the lack of any effective Republican opposition in the South, the Democratic candidates in those states are practically certain of election, even in overwhelmingly Republican years. While their colleagues in other states are swept out with the tide, the Southern members move on up the list, filling the vacancies left by those who may return with another swing of the political pendulum but who must, because of one defeat, begin at the bottom.

In 1920, for example, 121 of the 131 Democrats who survived the Republican landslide were from

Southern states, and when the Democrats regained control of the House in 1931, 16 out of 22 important committee chairmanships went to Southerners. In the present session of Congress, after ten years of Democratic control of the House, the number is fifteen. In the Senate, thirteen of twenty-three important chairmanships are held by Southerners. Where a chairmanship is held by a non-Southerner, a Dixie representative is likely to be ranking member, which means that he receives important subcommittee chairmanships and serves on conference committees to iron out differences between House and Senate on legislation passed.

Prior to the New Deal, the effects of the seniority principle upon congressional policy were not so apparent. With the split in the Democratic Party, however, we have had ample opportunity to examine its potentialities for obstruction, as an administration elected by overwhelming popular majorities has found itself balked on more than one occasion by the concentration of congressional leadership in the hands of persons who, although elected under the same party banner, were often no less unsympathetic with its aims than members of the opposition party.

In attacking the seniority principle, we cast no reflections on our constitutional forefathers. The rule developed quite informally as a matter of custom in the Senate and did not come into use in the House until 1911, when it was accepted as an alternative to the arbitrary rule of “Uncle Joe” Cannon. Its chief advantages are that it assigns leadership to members familiar with the processes of Congress and avoids the disruptive effects of an irresponsible scramble for place.

The first of these is largely discounted by the passing over of any experience that is not matched with a long and unbroken record in Congress. As for the matter of intra-party quarrels, surely the people of the United States have a right to ask for something better as a solution than a system which can encompass such a flagrant violation of the representative principle as the appointment of Senator Reynolds to the chairmanship of the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, STARK YOUNG; *Washington Editor:* MICHAEL STRAIGHT; *Treasurer:* DANIEL MEBANE; *Assistant Editors:* NIGEL DENNIS, BYRON DEXTER, OTIS FERGUSON, ELIZABETH HULING; *Contributing Editors:* H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, R. G. TUGWELL; *Advertising Manager:* E. C. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

EDITED AND PRODUCED UNDER UNION CONDITIONS BY CONTRACT WITH THE BOOK AND MAGAZINE GUILD, LOCAL 18, UOPWA, CIO

Armaments and Security

THE WAR is cutting Gordian knots and actualizing Utopias at a remarkable rate. Let me take two examples. About the beginning of 1940, a discussion group in London, whose meetings I attended, was preparing a document in which they were trying to paint not too unrealistic a picture of a possible post-war world. The subject of hemispheric defense and of the taking over by the U.S.A. of Allied bases in the New World was discussed. But it was decided that it was so unlikely to be realized that anything more than a bare mention of its possibility would compromise the realistic character of the document. Yet long before the year was out this Utopia had been translated into solid fact.

Again, during the first phase of the war many British heads were shaken over the impossibility of "paying for the war," even though Germany had long shown that this, in the classical financial sense, was no longer a real problem at all. Since the summer, this dethronement of finance from a position of primacy has come to be generally accepted for the internal affairs of nations; those who bother to think about the problem have realized that the only things which really count are materials, skills and man-hours of labor, and that, granted the supply of these, financial machinery can be devised to be the handmaiden of any policy. But the financial bogey continued to float over the international field, supported by still potent ghosts from the last war, such as reparations and war debts. Since then, however, Mr. Roosevelt has cut that Gordian knot with the lease-lend bill, so that both national and international policies can now proceed on their way unhaunted by this spectre.

It is worth while looking around to see whether such unexpectedly practical solutions may not be waiting round the corner in other fields too. In this article I would like to suggest that the wholesale arming of Britain by the United States provides the possibility of applying a successful cutting operation to the Gordian knot of international security.

The logical statement of the security problem is simple enough. It is clear that competitive armament is not a preventive of war, but if anything makes it more likely. From the standpoint of single nations, the two-thousand-year-old adage, *Si vis pacem, para bellum*, simply doesn't work any longer (perhaps it never did, but that is another matter). The conclusion is inescapable that nations must collaborate in some system of pooled security. But how? The League system of collective security did not work; nor did the system of alliances; nor did pacts for outlawing war, nor agreements for limiting armaments. An international armed force has been the usual theoretical solution; but no

one has ever suggested any really practical method of bridging the large gap that inevitably intervenes between our present system of national armies and this ideal system of an international army.

Is it not possible that the solution could grow out of the present situation? At the moment, two warring systems of nations are pouring out armaments—the Axis on the one side and the Anglo-Saxon world on the other. We will assume—and not just for the purposes of argument—that the Axis will be beaten, and will thus go out of action as a producer of arms. The sources of armaments within the Anglo-Saxon system will then be, in descending order of magnitude, the United States, Britain, and the British dominions together with India. Among these, specifications are already today becoming in large degree standardized. Poles, Dutch, Czechs and Free French have been trained in the use of British armaments, and now, with the inter-availability of British and American weapons as a declared goal of policy, the extent of the common pool will increase, and common specifications will be insisted upon throughout.

After the war is over, there will be the short-term danger to the stability of the industrial system arising from a too sudden reduction in the arms industry; there will also be the long-term danger to the security system arising from a return to the old methods whereby the peace-loving nation is penalized by finding itself defenseless against the threats or attacks of an aggressor which has preferred to spend its resources on guns instead of butter. Already, during this war, the democratic cause has been hampered repeatedly by our inability to send arms to stiffen the resistance of threatened neutrals. Can these two dangers not be married to produce safety?

Let us make a further assumption, but one which I hope is not unreasonable—that America, Britain and at least the majority of European nations will have become convinced of the need for active coöperation in international affairs, and for making concrete contributions toward security. The first task after the war will thus be to unite a group of peace-loving nations into what we may call a Security Club; its organization may be a very loose one to start with, provided it fulfils its primary function of giving reasonable security.

The great defect of all previous attempts at international security has been that not enough was put into the common pool. However, the contributions of different nations need not all be the same in our Security Club. The contribution of the small neutrals would be the sacrifice of their sovereign right to neutrality. The contribution of Britain and the U.S.A. as the two

biggest industrial nations, would be to shoulder the job of providing the actual armaments required. The essential contribution of France may well be greater coöperation in economic affairs. Wherever the writ of the Security Club runs—and it will run pretty widely if the war is properly won and Britain and the U. S. A. continue to live up to their world responsibilities—heavy arms shall only be manufactured by agreement, as part of a mutually arranged plan. In the early years, this would certainly mean that Britain and the U. S. A. would have to make the main contribution of arms, even though this would mean a delay in raising the general standard of living. By “heavy arms” I mean those without which a country cannot hope to put up a successful show in modern warfare—planes, tanks, heavy artillery, presumably submarines and larger warships. The prevention of illicit arms manufacture could be readily accomplished through the control of raw materials.

We need a similar club of nations concerned with world economic affairs, a Raw Materials Union under which would operate controls for ten or a dozen key raw materials. Withdrawal of raw-material supplies would effectively paralyze the effort of any nation that infringed the ban on heavy-arms manufacture. Further, modern air power would aid both in the control and in the detection of any infringement. Nor need we trouble any longer about the conversion of civil planes for military purposes. The fire power of modern planes has increased so much (a single fighter of the latest model has a higher fire power per second than a whole brigade of infantry during the first months of the last war!), that an unarmored civil plane would be a mere deathtrap if converted into a bomber. In addition, the gap between civil flying speed (limited by size of airports and by the necessity for carrying a profitable load) and the speed required of military planes is now much too great.

Thus, in the years immediately after the war, arms factories in the U. S. A. and Britain, and, let us hope, some in the dominions and India, would continue to turn out a supply of these heavy armaments. But once produced, they would not be supplied to the armies of this or that country (the exception would be, of course, that a certain proportion would still be needed to maintain peace in Europe, with Britain acting as the main European agent of the Security Club, until such time as a stable European Union could be established). They would be transported and stored in various strategic positions over that part of the world's surface which was under the control or supervision of Anglo-American power. These stores would be the arsenals of international security. Such other nations as applied for, and were granted, membership in the Security Club, would send contingents to be trained in the use of these arms, so that these strategic points would be both the arsenals and the training grounds of security. Thus,

though in normal times single nations would be restricted to such military playthings as machine guns, light field artillery and gunboats, and their armies would be in effect national militias or armed police forces, they would have trained personnel always available to man a flying force or an armored division, if needed to resist or to put down aggression.

The strategic points for the security arsenals would be chosen not merely in the light of the need for their supervision, but still more with the view of getting arms from them to any quarter of the globe as quickly as possible. The armchair strategist can play a pleasant game by selecting a list of such sites. As a first suggestion one might name Iceland, Bermuda, Trinidad, Singapore, Samoa, Gibraltar-Tangier, Port Said, western Scandinavia and the Low Countries, with a couple of South American sites if required; and of course, so long as Anglo-American control remained a necessity, there would be large arsenals at other convenient spots within the U. S. A. and the British Empire.

War emergencies may still arise in the post-war world. Certain countries are not likely at the outset to be members of the democratic club presided over by the Anglo-Saxon nations, and the possibility of infringement of the ban on heavy armaments by Germany or some other European power must not be wholly dismissed. But if the system of security arsenals we have just discussed were in existence, the emergencies could be met. Purely private arms manufacture would be a thing of the past. Governments would be the controlling agents of armament production, as part of the business of winning security. Lease and lend would still be the principle under which arms aid would operate, so that no question of payment would complicate the situation; and after the emergency was over, any surviving arms would be returned to stock. And the delays and weaknesses of the old systems would be avoided—delays in getting a decision to unite against an aggressor, and still more, delays in providing a victim of aggression with sufficient arms to resist. At the same time, the danger of private armament firms supplying all and sundry with arms would be obviated, and also the still greater dangers arising when an aggressive nation takes over the business of supplying arms. This was, of course, the case with Germany during the last few years before the war. The Nazis took advantage of their high level of armaments production on the one hand, and, on the other, of the threatening international situation which they had themselves done so much to create, to establish favorable trade relations with various small nations by offering to supply arms to them in return for products or concessions that Germany wanted.

A further result was that these armaments, though the small countries didn't know it at the time, constituted so many reserve arsenals (“insecurity arsenals” in this case) for Germany. For Germany has pro-

ceeded to overrun these countries one by one, and the great majority of these stores of arms have fallen intact into the invaders' hands.

Looking further ahead, it is clear that such a system could be rapidly and radically internationalized as circumstances permitted. The forces guarding the security arsenals could be made more and more international. Much more important, the training centers at the arsenal could be progressively internationalized, both in spirit and in personnel, so as to provide the nucleus of an international staff; and it could be arranged that the national contingents arriving for training could be brigaded together and trained as units of a single force.

As the Security Club became larger and more politically organized, others among its members could be called on to make payments toward the cost of production of the Club's heavy armaments, and might in some cases take over a part of their actual production.

The precise nature of the security provided would depend on the nature of the political settlement. To make it really effective in the case of aggression against a single nation, it would be necessary for other nations beside the victim to coöperate in defense measures. At the outset, coöperation might be confined to the victim's immediate neighbors, together with the striking force which Britain will certainly be compelled to keep in re-

serve for some years for possible use in Europe or the Middle East. But as time passed, that striking force could become an international one, and all countries within certain areas would automatically take joint action immediately danger threatened—all European countries, for instance, if the danger spot were in Europe, while another group headed by the U. S. A. would deal with the Pacific.

The existence of various national contingents other than her own in the British armed forces already provides a basis for such an international army; the establishment of international arsenals and training grounds would be a big second step in the same direction.

World peace will not be ensured by international military arrangements alone. International political and economic organizations will clearly be required as well. In particular, international raw-material control is essential for any satisfactory security system. But it is more realistic to begin by treating each as a separate problem, rather than to start with an elaborate and comprehensive scheme comprising every aspect of joint international action. And if this be true, then the most practical way of getting results will be to build the arrangements for military coöperation in peace on those which have grown out of the need for coöperating in war.

JULIAN HUXLEY

Blacklist in Action

THE BIGGEST and most accessible, if least accurate, industrial blacklist ever known in this country was compiled at public expense and is distributed from the Government Printing Office. It is extensively advertised in the daily papers by its publisher, Representative Martin Dies.

Last August Mr. Dies announced that he had "over 100,000 propagandists for totalitarian ideology" card-indexed, and last November he proposed to publish the names "industry by industry." But the latest committee report, for January of this year, contented itself with a reference to the importance of the files: "These files contain the names and records of several hundred thousand individuals. . . . These files cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the world today."

Recent Dies publicity practice has been to dole out file references in timely press releases. "Dies Says SWOC Reds Plan Steel Tie-Up," "Reds Run Bus Strike, Dies Report Charges," "Dies Holds Reds Run Curran Union," "Dies Says Reds Plot Big Aluminum Strike." So run headlines ranging from the relatively modest type of The New York Times to the three-and-one-half-inch banner of The Journal and American. Although the hurried reader might assume that Mr. Dies holds instantaneous hearings in current or threatened labor disputes, the testimony coinciding with the head-

lines just quoted concerned a Washington peace group headed by the wife of a young New Dealer. Mr. Dies was able to "report" on the bus strike and other union activities by reaching for his card index.

To ask additional guards for state secrets supposedly hidden in the Dies files is a standard publicity device on days when news is scarce. Actually the committee has rushed into print with any information it could lay its hands on, and once or twice—as in the case of records seized, contrary to court order, in Philadelphia—the haste has been unseemly. His detractors have had to admit that at least he always rattled before striking.

But, learning subtlety in dealing with the press, Mr. Dies has come to realize that publicity, when planted, often flourishes best in partial shade. Present policy is to dress up thirteen volumes of published hearings by calling the testimony "evidence in possession of the committee" or "our files." To give volume and page reference might make it too clear that the evidence was provided by those first-year witnesses described by a Washington Post reporter as "something scraped from the under side of the woodwork." (In a moment of disarming frankness, Mr. Dies said, "Boy, are you right!") Dies committee members now admit that the first-year testimony was valueless except "to wake up the country to need for an investigation,"

that is, except as alarmist propaganda. But in print, as in the case of the New York bus strike, Mr. Dies continues to rely on that testimony, to refer to it as "information in the hands of the committee which proves. . ."

The policy of holding public hearings, abandoned because of protests against unsupported smear testimony, has been reverted to in the investigation of federal agencies. The first public hearing fed the newspapers their old Dies headline fodder, when an undercover agent of the committee blared that "a responsible official" had told her that the Interior Department's Bituminous Coal Division was "loaded from top to bottom with Communists." Representative Voorhis denounced such a blackening of entire groups of federal employees without evidence and forced a temporary adjournment. But the story made the front pages. It can only be hoped that the accuracy of witnesses has improved since the day when a dozen addresses south of Forty-second Street were inserted in the record as "known Communist headquarters in Harlem."

Recent publications of the committee have been delayed or irregular, sometimes numbered out of sequence; but bundles from the Government Printing Office with their big red labels—"Strictly Confidential"—are piled up in the committee rooms on the top floor of the old House Office Building, and Dies committee typewriters, busily clicking, have overflowed into the corridor. It is explained that, pending publication of testimony, information as to conditions in vital industries may be furnished responsible local authorities who make proper written application to the committee chairman. Mr. Dies has proposed to open thirteen regional offices, complete with files and records, over the country; this proposal recalls his amendment to the wages-and-hours law providing for state instead of federal administration, on the ground that "a state agency would be more accessible to an employer."

That the primary purpose of the Dies Committee was to fight unions might have been evident from the first. When Morris Ernst complained that Mr. Dies had failed to define "un-American activities," he overlooked a speech made back in 1936. Then, asking an investigation of sitdown strikes, Mr. Dies characterized the strikes as "un-American." Two years later, when the big blond Texan took over the Dickstein resolution for investigation of "un-American activities," he called for post-mortems on Flint, Akron and Detroit.

Some labor circles see in the committee procedure a simple effort to wreck the CIO, with the collaboration of such AFL leaders as John P. Frey and Joseph P. Ryan. There is, without question, effort to halt all effective organization by personal attacks on union men. "Names! Give us names!" the committee has demanded of its witnesses, and no name has been too insignificant. Little harm could come from efforts to "link" with fifth-column activities Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Mrs. Roosevelt, Attorney General Jackson, Bette

Davis and Mr. Justice Murphy. But persons of less prominence could be as unfairly accused with more damaging results; young union organizers are almost as vulnerable as school teachers.

More, with Teutonic thoroughness ("My mother is of German descent"), Mr. Dies has gone after organizations and individuals guilty only of supporting labor. To distinguish between his investigation and the FBI field, Mr. Dies insists that the committee is charged with exposure of activities within existing law. Dies vouchers—salary of investigator, \$250; payment to informer, \$5; payment to informer, \$75; truck to move records seized in raid, \$10—show expenses appropriate to a criminal investigation; but Mr. Dies insists that law-abiding Americans are his concern.

An effective blacklist can, of course, dispense with legal charges as with accuracy; listing a name is enough. That Mr. Dies really means his names to be used as a blacklist is evident from committee action regarding government employees. At the time, it was possible to believe that seizure and publication of the Washington mailing list of the American League for Peace and Democracy was a trick to annoy New Dealers. But the committee has followed up with reminders to the various departments—So-and-So, exposed by the committee, is still in your employ.

As civil-service rules protect government employees from mere slander, so labor laws now afford some protection to union members in organized industry; that is what Mr. Dies means when he says that the NLRB forces industrialists to employ "thousands of known saboteurs" (read members of CIO unions). But in unorganized industry, the blacklist is as important as employers choose to make it.

Northern observers of Mr. Dies's career are wont to wonder what reward accompanies this service; but to a Southerner acquainted with Mr. Dies's background, earnest effort to help the corporations lick the unions is in itself no proof of corruption. Southern politicians are often willing to work for corporations without pay, just as Southern towns offer tax-free land for runaway mills, or just as Northern newspapers take the side of big business—not bribed, just honestly convinced.

Mr. Dies's home district in East Texas lies next the domain of the late Huey Long, and far from the cattle country where men are Mavericks. Roughly the size of Massachusetts, it is a district of poverty and prejudice, the sort of Southern country that, like the man studying to be a moron, hopes some day to achieve wealth and exploitation. Mr. Dies got out of the backwoods as far as the pretty little Gulf port of Orange, which enjoyed a brief oil and shipping boom in the last war and hopes that another will lift it once more out of its normal state of pawn to the local bank, if only the unions don't make trouble.

Defining liberalism somewhat archaically as no more than belief in freedom of speech and of the press, Mr. Dies claims to favor both. Years ago he intro-

duced a resolution to defend freedom of the press from the NRA. But like his father, in Congress during the First World War, the present Representative Dies feels that you needn't be lenient with people who would stir up labor trouble; the fact that they would do so proves them "ignorant foreigners" or "infected with the virus of internationalism." True Americans, Mr. Dies explains, know that "class tolerance" is as important as racial or religious tolerance.

That the eighteenth-century liberalism of Southern tradition now amounts in practice to provincial anarchy has been noted; it may be added that anarchy is a political vacuum inviting to fascism. Mr. Dies will tell you that he is as much opposed to one foreignism as another, and he resolutely refuses to distinguish his right hand from his left. This confusion enables the committee to spend its time and funds attacking unions and New Dealers for sympathy with what Mr. Dies's radio pronunciation calls the "Commonest" Party, while Mr. Dies declaims against Nazi-fascist dangers which the public wants investigated. His book, "The Trojan Horse in America," is full of this doubletalk.

But, twenty-odd years ago, Martin Dies senior said he preferred anarchy to socialism; and his son has been so busy chasing socialistic snakes in the Red network of the labor field that he has had little time for Bund camps and Italian societies. In return for this neglect Bund leaders and native fascists have expressed varying degrees of admiration for the Dies Committee, all very embarrassing but difficult to repudiate when basic ideals of a tight little, white little, right little nationalism are the same. Several times Mr. Dies has made moves to found an "Americanism" group of his own, somewhat on the model of Senator Reynolds' Vindicators; at one time this embryo organization got as far as a platform demanding "Jobs for Americans," which turned out to be the motto of the resurgent Klan. There is little doubt that the more ecstatic admirers of Mr. Dies are sheet or shirt-minded, with the usual anti-Semitic trimmings. "God Bless Martin Dies—Down with All Dirty Jews" was penciled, with flourishes, on a bookmark in the New York public library copy of Mr. Dies's book. His favorite Trojan-horse story makes the point that the horse was "led in by a refugee," and legislation recommended by the committee would bar immigration from Europe.

It was Huey Long who warned that fascism in this country would come in the guise of anti-fascism; and before Huey was cold in his grave his Texas neighbor was attacking the wages-and-hours law on the ground that it would "establish a fascist bureaucracy." Alarmists could make a good case for Martin Dies as a potential nationalist leader; if publicity alone could do the trick, there might be danger. Back in the Wilson era, Martin Dies senior made headlines by sniping from the South at a Democratic administration, and Wilson tried vainly to "purge" him. The same tactics worked even better for Martin junior. More, to pages of pub-

licity willingly given by the anti-New Deal press, Mr. Dies has added many columns earned by clever timing and stunting. Back in 1938 he prophesied "the greatest patriotic revival that this country has witnessed in many decades," and *dies irae* found him ready to profit along with the manufacturers of lapel flags.

Another element of nationalist leadership, backing by the right people, is hardly beyond the Dies reach. Mr. Dies has been hailed as "the Sir Galahad of American politics" by a Son of the Revolution in New York, cheered by paraders in Westchester and mentioned for the presidency by Father Coughlin and by Borough President George U. Harvey of Queens. More important, in an argument over funds back in 1939 he told Congress that private offers to finance his investigation had exceeded half a million dollars. He was guest of honor at a Biltmore Hotel luncheon sponsored by the National Economic Council and presided over by Merwin K. Hart, whose political creed could hardly find better expression than in the Dies doctrine of "class tolerance."

But hark back to Huey Long, and you feel that the weakness in Mr. Dies's position is the anti-fascism requirement. It is difficult for Mr. Dies to appear convincingly anti-fascist, and certainly beyond him to display the degree of genuine concern for the people which won Long his start. Long, after all, abolished the poll tax in Louisiana; the Dies Committee has pointed a suspicious finger at organizations seeking to abolish it in other Southern states. Huey Long wanted, or said he wanted, to share the wealth; Mr. Dies's "class tolerance" theory is emphatic in forbidding envy of the rich. In his book, Mr. Dies says it is a "serious mistake" to "define human rights as something distinct from and diametrically opposed to property rights," and he complains that "for years they have been building up this utterly senseless idea of civil rights. . . ."

The question of Mr. Dies's future may be solved by his announcement for the Senate seat left vacant by the death of Morris Sheppard. Before Northern critics make harsh remarks about the Texas electorate, it may be well to remark that, thanks to the poll tax, Mr. Dies need represent only about 5 percent of the people of Texas. One Gallup estimate gave him the support of 65 percent of the people of the United States.

Mr. Dies's removal to the upper house would not distress his colleagues. They vote for him but they deplore the Dies publicity which swells their mail with letters from home. One committee member, off the record, described the investigation as "a Gene Autry show . . . I wish to God I'd never heard of it." But official opposition comes only from Jerry Voorhis of California, author of the law that requires registration of organizations having foreign affiliations.

The committee cannot be credited with legislative accomplishment. It has, however, served to advertise its chairman. And it has bought us a blacklist.

WILLSON WHITMAN

Tax Excess Profits!

A PART FROM the general aspect of social desirability, there are three strong reasons for the enactment of a sharp excess-profits tax. First, from the standpoint of revenue, is the immediate problem of meeting defense costs. In the second place, as George Soule pointed out several weeks ago (*The New Republic*, April 14), the approach of capacity production necessitates stiffer taxes on profits as a means of preventing inflation. And, since it concerns national morale in a deepening crisis, the third reason is possibly the weightiest of all—we cannot afford the inevitable public cynicism which would certainly accompany a bumper crop of defense millionaires.

The present Excess-Profits-Tax Act, which fails on every count, is one of the most shameless pieces of lobby-written legislation passed in many years. A Congress responsive to selfish business interests equipped it with loopholes that gave an out to every kind of potential profiteering. In its eagerness to appease business, Congress rushed through a tax bill so cumbersome and complicated that the men who drafted it were unable later to interpret its provisions. But while its details promised a field day for accountants, everyone familiar with corporate earnings was sure of one thing: it wasn't going to tax. *The New Republic* pointed out on at least four occasions that the act would prove ridiculously ineffective. Now that the profit returns are rolling in, the visible evidence of defense swag is so shocking that an embarrassed Congress is bound to curb the profiteers. How much, depends a great deal on the resistance of industry, which, on the whole, has already proved its inability to subordinate profits to defense.

The major fault of the present act is that it literally writes profiteering into law. This is accomplished by giving corporations an option in establishing their credit for excess-profits-tax purposes. The tax rates begin to operate after profits have passed 95 percent of the average earnings in the four-year base period, 1936-39, or, if the corporation prefers, after they have passed an 8-percent return on invested capital. The latter method was made to order for the heavy industries, the railroads and many other groups which benefit most heavily from defense orders. Their invested-capital figure (often grossly puffed) had kept earnings below eight percent even in the artificially stimulated boom year of 1937. As a result of the go-ahead signal in the Excess-Profits-Tax Act, some of these corporations came up with staggering net profits. U. S. Steel, whose profits in the preceding four years had averaged about \$46,000,000, had a net in 1940 of \$102,000,000 and *did not pay a penny* in excess-profits taxes. Republic Steel, with a four-year average of \$7,000,000, passed a \$21,000,000 net and went tax-free. Bethlehem Steel

went from \$19,000,000 to \$49,000,000, even after setting aside \$6,000,000 for excess-profit taxes (which was unnecessarily high). And Crucible Steel, after setting aside \$1,000,000, jumped from about \$2,500,000 to over \$6,000,000. The railroads, of which a group of twenty-five have just announced an increase in net income of 198.2 percent for the first quarter of this year, escaped the excess-profits tax almost without exception. But Assistant Secretary of the Treasury John L. Sullivan, in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, gave what is so far the classic example of legal profiteering—a company with \$70,000,000 in defense contracts, profits 3,000 percent higher than in 1939 and *not one dollar* paid in excess-profits taxes.

The tax schedule, in those cases where it does operate, is only a partial bar to excess profits. This is best demonstrated by the earnings records of a few companies, selected at random, which used the average-earnings method, base period 1936-39. (The tax starts at 25 percent on the first \$20,000 of excess profits and is graduated to 50 percent on \$500,000 and above.) In round numbers, United Aircraft earnings jumped from \$5,000,000 to \$13,000,000; Glenn L. Martin (aircraft) from \$2,000,000 to \$5,500,000; Newport News (shipbuilding) from \$1,500,000 to \$4,500,000; Monarch Machine Tool from \$400,000 to \$1,200,000. War babies, every one, which met the excess-profits tax head on and came through covered with gravy.

The Treasury's recent excess-profits-tax proposals, as presented by Mr. Sullivan with the President's backing, would, if enacted into law, correct the situation somewhat. For one thing, they would produce about a billion dollars in revenue in 1941 and so prevent a raid on low incomes either in the form of income and excise taxes or the retail sales tax for which the thoughtful *Wall Street Journal* has been plumping. But the desirability of the administration's tax scheme should not be measured by the howl that has gone up from business and its press and congressional spokesmen. While a billion in revenue looks good at first glance, it really emphasizes the mildness of the proposed plan. Applied to corporate profits of 1940, it would have produced about \$400,000,000, according to Treasury estimates. But 1941 will show a tremendous expansion in defense work and general business volume over 1940. According to *The Exchange*, official organ of the New York Stock Exchange, the earnings of the first 357 companies to report for the first quarter of this year show a gain of 19 percent, while dividends rose 8.1 percent, to \$437,000,000. Viewed against this kind of profit-taking, a billion from excess-profits taxes in 1941 won't be more impressive than \$400,000,000 would

have been for 1940. If the point still needs illustration, it might be noted that three of the steel companies previously mentioned *alone* showed excess profits in 1940 aggregating \$100,000,000 over normal average earnings for the four-year base period.

In principle the administration's new proposal is a return to the invested-capital method. Each company would compute its annual profits in terms of percentage of invested capital for the four-year period 1936-39. The average percentage would then become its credit for excess-profits-tax purposes. If a company having \$1,000,000 of invested capital had average yearly earnings of \$50,000 through 1936-39, its excess-profits-tax credit would be five percent and it could earn up to that amount tax-free. If its earnings were \$70,000, the credit would be seven percent, etc. Beyond that, the excess-profits tax would apply. New capital could earn eight percent tax-free, or ten percent in those corporations whose new capital additions left the total invested capital under \$500,000. This is a concession to the "little fellow."

Theoretically this method is sound enough. Its effectiveness in practice, however, is determined by two factors which operate against an adequate tax measure. The first is an excessive allowable credit. Under this plan it is set at 10 percent, a cozy profit indeed when sacrifice is the order of the day. The second is the graduated rate which here captures only 33 percent on profits in excess of net income which do not exceed 15 percent of invested capital, 52 percent on the excess between 15 and 30 percent, and 65 percent on the excess over 30 percent. There is already considerable evidence that both rates and credit are too lenient. Not only is the proposed yield of one billion dollars in 1941 demonstrably inadequate; estimates published in *The Wall Street Journal* (whose statistics are acceptable even if its policies are not) indicate that strong earners like the major utilities (Bell, Edison, etc.) will get off tax-free. The chains (Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward) might actually benefit from the change, while the chemicals (du Pont, Hercules Powder, etc.) and the railroads would get off with negligible penalties. Judging from preliminary surveys, the same is apt to be true of the oils and rubbers.

Naturally, the overall acceptability of the plan, even if credits and rates were tightened, would depend largely on sharp scrutiny by the Treasury of invested-capital statements. Many corporation balance sheets would undoubtedly show less invested capital if obsolescent plant, good will, deferred payments, etc., could be weeded out and stripped of their disguises. Such items enable many corporations to claim consistently low earnings. Under the Treasury scheme, these chronic low earners (showing a four-year average of less than four percent) would pay only a flat ten-percent tax on excess profits until earnings reached four percent, which is a bigger grab than many of them deserve. An objection should also be noted to the eight-

percent profit allowed on new capital. Considering the government's liberal amortization schedule and plant-loan policies, and the relative absence of risk involved in expansion for defense, six percent in defense industries would be at least fair.

There is one new feature of the administration's proposal which should be upheld against every attack by industry and incorporated in the final bill, whatever its character. That is the extension of the excess-profits designation to "normal," excessive peacetime earnings, whether in defense industries or not and apart from the question of increased profits. One may (industry does) call this opportunism. Yet it would be socially justifiable at any time and is unquestionably fair right now. The fact that a corporation earned 20 or 30 percent or more on its invested capital in the base period should not give it the privilege of continuing at that rate. The 10-percent credit limit is applied to all corporations in the administration's plan. The principle is worth a fight.

Defective as it is, the new plan is bound to be weakened further through lobbying and compromise. The press has already begun to see in it the End of the American Way of Life, while ranking taxmakers in Congress have promised a long, bitter fight. The simple fact is that business wants to go right on taking its usual profits and has no intention of making sacrifices until forced to by public opinion. The bill to be written this summer, therefore, will not be the final one. It is too bad that the President does not find it politic to bring the tax question directly to the nation. Both he and business might be surprised to discover the widespread desire for a ruthless tax on profiteers.

Such a tax, to be logical and effective, would apply the excess-profits tax *before* applying the normal corporation tax. It would be based on four-year average earnings instead of invested capital, but companies which earned in excess of six percent on invested capital would be allowed only a percentage of their credit. Nor is it difficult to establish a graduated scale of levies that would put teeth in the tax. Most of the complexities in the present act arose not from the difficulties of writing a good tax bill but from the devious methods employed to protect numerous industries from taxation.

Group I in the table on the next page shows what the forthright application of effective excess-profits-tax principles would mean in the cases of the four steel companies previously mentioned. Group II illustrates how war babies now using the average-earnings method and the non-defense, so-called "growth companies," would be affected. The base period for average net earnings is 1936-39; the normal corporation tax of 30 percent is levied *after* the excess-profits tax is taken. The schedule: excess profits equal to 10 percent of the four-year average are taxed at 50 percent, the second 10 percent of excess profits at 60, the third 10 percent at 70, the fourth at 80, the fifth at 90 and all above that point at 90 percent. Credit in Group II is 95 percent of the four-year average.

GROUP I Corporation	Four-Year Average Earnings	Net Profit 1940	Excess-Profits Taxes 1940	Excess-Profits Taxes (under schedule given)	Net profit (under schedule given)
U. S. Steel	\$46,661,912	\$102,200,000	0	\$55,650,000	\$51,000,000
Bethlehem Steel ..	18,902,500	48,677,524	\$6,000,000	40,900,000	21,100,000
Republic Steel	7,325,603	21,113,507	0	16,735,000	8,690,000
Crucible Steel	2,460,274	6,230,180	1,040,000	5,360,000	2,894,000
GROUP II					
Abbot Laboratories ..	\$1,600,000	\$2,239,408	\$183,000	\$980,000	\$1,554,000
Glenn L. Martin . . .	2,083,800	5,424,490	886,000	4,980,000	2,425,000
Monarch Machine Tool	386,394	1,183,103	763,955	1,878,000	498,400
Coca-Cola	24,920,247	28,884,752	2,500,000	5,308,000	25,369,000
Sterling Products	8,891,673	9,229,231	200,000	1,583,500	8,103,000
United Aircraft	5,146,107	13,139,984	11,720,669	24,575,000	6,423,500
Newport News	1,454,948	4,383,177	1,735,000	6,888,000	1,870,000

The last column is of special importance because it proves that this is not merely taxation with a vengeance but a *true excess-profits tax*. That is, it captures those profits which, during the defense period, spill over the normal peacetime level. And it is pointless to inquire whether the excess is due directly or indirectly to defense orders or merely through growth or accident. In fact, corporations with high normal earnings should

have their credit for excess-profits-tax purposes frozen at not over six percent. Such a program effectively rules out profiteering, normal or defense. But isn't that what we're trying to do? Compared to the necessary measures, the administration plan is merely a step in the right direction; but Washington is at this moment jammed with lobbyists persuading Congress to make sure that the step is never completed. MAX GISSEN

Shirts That Shrink

WITH NATIONAL INCOME RISING by a billion dollars a month and defense expenditures heading for two billions a month, price control has become of critical importance in the defense problem. After an ineffective start, Leon Henderson, administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, moved to control the prices of many basic defense materials. So far he has limited himself mainly to raw materials and semi-finished products, freezing the price of aluminum scrap rather than aluminum, and cotton yarns rather than cotton goods. But Henderson is watching the rise in prices of consumer goods and already a retail-price section of the OPACS is being organized.

Meanwhile the consumer division of the OPACS, under Miss Harriet Elliott, is concerned by a disguised form of price rise which is threatening consumers. Manufacturers who have found that price rises are unpopular in Washington are increasing their profit margins by maintaining prices and lowering quality.

Announcements in trade journals over the last three months indicate how widespread this movement to cut quality is. In cotton goods, a low grade of percale is substituted for better material. In rugs, good wool is replaced by cheaper Argentine wool. In shirts, poor quality of broadcloth is sold in place of good broadcloth. In men's suits, rayon waste is worked into wool fabrics. In the soles of shoes, paper is being substituted for leather. In these industries and more, Miss Elliott charges that serious deterioration has taken place.

Only a few weeks ago, The Journal of Commerce announced that a package of Post Toasties would not rise in price. It was added that the package would contain thirteen instead of fifteen ounces. In other words, Post Toasties were rising in price by nearly nine percent. This is called "coöperating in national defense."

The effect of this deterioration in values bears most heavily upon the low-income groups which can least afford to have their standards lowered. "The youngsters whose worn-out shoes cannot be replaced must stay away from school," said Miss Elliott. "The fathers whose work clothes cannot be replaced must rob the food money."

But the deterioration in quality is also a direct threat to the defense program. "The dress that fades, the shirt that shrinks, the sheets that split," said Miss Elliott, "are no longer just individual mishaps. . . . If we allow the quality of consumers' goods to depreciate to a point where they must be replaced after a comparatively short time in use, we will have wasted not only materials and purchasing power but labor and machines." If manufacturers, instead of raising the price of shoes by 25 percent, reduce their quality and wearability by 50 percent, the total expenditures on shoes and the resources employed in their production will be increased at a time when income and resources for civilians are limited. In the last war the high replacement rate in consumers' goods due to deterioration in quality was an acute problem. It need not be now if Henderson acts.

Henderson's first weapon is the power of the Depart-

ment of Justice to prosecute deterioration in the quality of manufacturers' goods as a disguised price rise if it is a result of collusion. The Attorney General has already promised Henderson the full cooperation of the Justice Department in protecting consumers.

Second, Henderson may include a quality order in the price order with which he freezes the price of goods. In many industries existing standards are already definite enough to make enforcement possible.

Yet it is plain that both these actions are insufficient in themselves. There can be no security for consumers in America until we have at least as thoroughgoing a system of standards as Britain and Germany have today. In both countries rigid systems of standards are operated by government and by industry for the protection of consumers. Without such standards consumers are powerless to make necessary price comparisons by the clear distinction in the quality of the goods they buy.

There are the beginnings of such a system in America today. Many states enforce standards on consumption goods and many industries have established standards for themselves. But neither of these systems can be used now, although the manufacturers at the National Nutrition Conference will probably insist that they can. State standards have been set up too often to serve as barriers to interstate commerce, and standards applied by industry have too often been instruments for the control of an industry by a few great firms.

In the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission the precedent already exists for a federal system of standards. If Henderson acts with the courage that this situation demands of him, he will undertake very soon to develop a federal standard system. He will of course meet with strong opposition from some industrialists. The fomenters of sleep, hunger and alkaline stomach, the producer who insists that "the priceless ingredient of every product is the honor and integrity of its maker," will have to come out in the open and sell their products for what they are worth.

But this system of standards will take more than a year to establish. Meanwhile the shirt to which Miss Elliott referred is still shrinking.

I believe that the answer to the shrinking shirt is a simple one. If we cannot have standards of many grades, we can at least have the standard of one grade and enforce it. We can have a defense blanket, a defense shoe, a defense loaf of bread and a defense shirt. When these products are purchased by housewives in the low-income group, they will know that they are buying a guaranteed grade of material and quality of manufacture. The defense blanket will afford warmth after its first washing; the defense shoe will not have a paper sole, the loaf of bread will contain flour, not plaster; and the defense shirt will not shrink.

My latest new shirt is shrinking fast. Please, Mr. Henderson, let me buy my first defense shirt soon.

Washington

MICHAEL STRAIGHT

Washington Notes

Democracy Holds Its Own

THIS HAS BEEN a bad season for the prophets of doom, particularly for those who work the left slope of Delphi. Ever since the defense and aid-to-Britain effort started, such oracles as Earl Browder, Norman Thomas and John L. Lewis have been assuring us on behalf of their several sects that American fascism is just around the corner.

Browder, in an unusual state of dialectical dither even for him, has insisted that it is an imperialist war according to Marx and has counseled this country to remain neutral "like Russia." Lewis' Biblical bombast has issued from the premise that President Roosevelt, having supped at labor's table, is about to fry the workers in deep fat and serve them to the du Ponts as soon as the war hysteria burns hot enough. Thomas, whose seemingly constant radio oratory begins to sound like a recorded program run off too fast, has agreed with Browder and Lewis that this is just the World War over again, but worse, and that freedom is as good as gone right now. Among the three of them, they haven't produced so much as a funny story since Browder told the one about how the Russians, in defiance of the Nazis, delivered the grateful peasantry of Poland from its medieval bondage.

All three of these self-proclaimed foes of fascism quit the fight on fascism when the theatre of its war broadened from Spain to Europe and then to the world. All three have given, each in his own inimitable fashion, the excuse that to fight fascism abroad would be to bring fascism to the United States—indeed that the defense and the lease-lend programs already are bringing it. They and their followers seem so certain of this that they invite examination of their thesis.

The defense effort started more than a year ago on a large scale and the lease-lend law has been on the books long enough for its effects to be observed. What has happened to organized labor, always the first victim of fascism, in the last few months? Has President Roosevelt made the national emergency an excuse for oppressing labor? Has labor lost any of its liberties? Has the CIO been dismembered, as Lewis' friends predicted? Quite the contrary.

Organized labor, and particularly the CIO, have won their most impressive victories this spring—organization of Bethlehem and Ford and 10-percent pay increases in several basic industries. And these victories were won with the tacit approval and at least passive assistance of the White House. The Ford and Bethlehem capitulations followed long and well planned campaigns by the CIO, but it is no accident that they came when they did. Ford and Bethlehem had successfully defied the CIO in normal times, but they simply could not hold out against the combined pressure of labor, the administration and a public which well understood that these companies would benefit largely from defense contracts. The same combination of forces accounted for wage increases in steel and in General Motors and for less conspicuous gains elsewhere. Lewis' own mine workers stand to get their biggest wage increment out of negotiations now going on, and here again it will be because of, not in spite of, the defense emergency and the democratic forces it has let loose.

So far labor's enemies in Congress have got precisely nowhere with their campaign to limit the right to strike. Without discounting the danger that reactionary Democrats and Republicans may some time succeed in passing legislation intended to mutilate the Wagner Act, it should be said that this danger was there before the defense program started. It should be said, too, that the danger is no greater now, and is perhaps less than it was before the presidential election. Congress well knows that a veto awaits any measure striking at labor's fundamental rights, and this knowledge will continue to operate as an effective deterrent. The only positive act of the administration affecting labor's position since the emergency set in was appointment of the Dykstra Mediation Board—an agency which has been more helpful than detrimental to labor's interests, however much Lewis may growl in his beard about its strike-breaking activities. So far as anyone knows, the administration is planning no further move on the labor front.

On the other hand, much has been done to protect what labor got out of the peacetime New Deal. Take prices, for example. The gloomy triumvirate of the Left have chosen either to ignore the administration's price policy or to exaggerate the early shortcomings of its execution. What good, they ask, are higher wages if price increases eat them up? What indeed? But the fact is that this hasn't happened. Prices have risen, but not alarmingly and not enough, by a long way, to offset the steel workers' raise. Now Leon Henderson, one of the President's ablest assistants, has been given the authority to see that prices do not run away and he can be expected to use his powers to good advantage. The price situation was seriously disturbed by the congressional decision to increase crop loans as a gesture of good will to farmers. But even the consequences of this hand-out need not be disastrous to industrial workers if middlemen are prevented from using the higher farm prices as an excuse for broadening their own margin of profit.

Meanwhile, the possibility of a serious inflation seems to have been made more remote by the Treasury's determination to try again for the drastic excess-profits-tax legislation it presented to Congress last year. The plan was turned down by the House and Senate on the theory that it would undermine business incentive. That argument can scarcely be made now that there is more general realization of the extent and urgency of the defense effort. Nobody has even tried as yet to refute the arguments for heavy excess-profits taxes made to the House Ways and Means Committee by Chairman Marriner S. Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and by Henderson. In fact, it now seems quite probable that the next tax bill, in its individual income provisions as well as its excess-profits rates, will be by far the best from a social point of view that Congress has ever enacted. No one can deny that there has been fumbling and confusion in Washington during President Roosevelt's third administration. The OEM and its subsidiaries are the principal offenders. Recently, uncertainty, or an appearance of uncertainty, in the White House and State Department also has been harmful to the cause of world democracy. The point is that the fumbling and the mistakes are themselves manifestations that democracy is at work. The assumption that this country's shift from peace to war economy under the Roosevelt leadership already has sown the seeds of fascism, or is about to, simply doesn't hold up under scrutiny.

Washington

T. R. B.

To Paint What Then I Saw

The Dramatic Imagination, by Robert Edmond Jones.
New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce. 157 pages. \$2.

THIS FEBRUARY marked the twenty-sixth anniversary of Robert Edmond Jones's first production in the American theatre and the advent, it may very well be, also of the first great spirit working through its décor. With what body and breath he endowed it is widely known, not merely among designers and the younger practitioners of that art of stage design, but among many at large, almost to the point of legend, though never, perhaps, as exactly or fully known as should be. His triumphs, his encounters with lack of comprehension of his work, and his failures make up a case history that parallels that of any fine artist; but his good fortune, and his rewards too—note that—have been that his sum remains intact of luster, fresh application and advancing spirit.

This new volume is a record, as Mr. Jones tells us, of reflections and speculations that are the fruit of twenty-five years of almost continuous work in the American theatre, during which he has been associated with the foremost artists of his time. These thoughts have come to him in the midst of rehearsals and in dress-parades and on the long journeys to out-of-town tryouts and in the continual collaboration with playwrights and managers and actors and stagehands and costumers and electricians and wigmakers and shoemakers that has made up his life in the theatre. Out of those manifold contacts of his experience, as he tells us, the image of a new theatre has gradually formed itself—"a theatre not yet made with hands"; and toward that ideal theatre he looks and works. That theatre is the substance and motivation for this volume of essays.

The very nature of such a theatre—of the subject itself—implies that it could not be set down or conveyed in the mere black and white of words, as indeed it cannot in any one medium out of those that go to make up the theatre art. But what is outlined, stated constructively, or foreseen, or sensed as shadowy forms and possibility, or as the suggestion of some approaching image, has the same creative element that Mr. Jones's work in the visual theatre has presented.

The book contains eight essays on various aspects of this theatre that the author has in his mind: a new kind of drama; art in the theatre; the theatre as it was and as it is; advice to a young stage designer; stage costume; light and shadow in the theatre; suggestions toward a new theatre; and a brief final essay called "Behind the Scenes," hard to define as to content but remarkable, stinging, fluent, beautiful—curiously downright and exact, and at the same time rich and compassionate and deep—about the stage beyond the audience's view and about actors, their special nature and position apart, and how they become aware of the profound duality of life at the moment when they speak their first lines on a stage, and thereafter all their acting is animated by it (they call it giving a good performance).

Some of the volume has the character of lecture matter, with the implied direction toward eloquence, persuasive appeal and multiplied allusions, illustrations and frequent quotations from the established theatre classics of the past. These passages vary in their success, but for many readers may serve as a kind of orchestration for the burden of the book's idea, or as incitement and expansion in their approach. By

and large and at their best, these quotations and allusions are useful because they help secure and project the impression of the range and authority that this book is entitled to. The several essays are headed by quotations, mostly from dead authors. A few of these are not easily plausible—why, for instance, must we quote Emerson, to be told that “not imitation but creation is the aim” in “the fine arts”—which is pretty much an old wheeze by now? But many of them are extraordinarily to the point—to the point, which in its very self is a form of beauty—with regard to the matter that follows them. We have, for example in that final chapter on the actor, Talbot Mundy’s lines about life’s being like a play, and the gods who watch the drama, knowing that somebody must play the villain’s part, the pauper’s and so on—“He, therefore, who is wise plays pauper, king, or villain with the gods in mind.” That leads us rightly on to the lines from Plotinus that close this essay and the book—and what other writer on the theatre would quote it?—“For the soul, a divine thing, a fragment as it were of the primal Being, makes beautiful according to their capacity all things whatsoever that it grasps and molds.”

If it takes Mr. Robert Edmond Jones a whole book even to suggest what this ideal theatre will be that he discerns from within the violent shadows of his imagination, and believes, and has himself done so much to bring into its due existence, how should a mere review like this provide a statement or definition of what he proposes? I can only say, for all the inexpressible content here involved, that when the pages are all read and this book is closed, there is a vast clarity about it, an inward wholeness, a perfectly defined movement, clouded with its own bright multiplicity of wings, but clear as a flight.

Perhaps all I should say otherwise should best go thus:

That never in the history of our present-day theatre was such a book more needed.

That there are passages here where the content is subtly original, based on genuine experience, and with a capacity for numberless rereadings on our part.

That there are others that are superb in form at once and then suddenly dazzling in the observation and meaning they present; as when, for instance, the author observes that as soon as we have arrived at an understanding of the inner pattern of any of Shakespeare’s plays and can visualize it on his own stage, “we discover an unsuspected visual brilliance arising directly from the variety of the action.”

And that the style, the tone and the mood of aspiration, hope and foreknowledge in this writing on the theatre reflect the influences and bear constantly on them the marks of the contagion of the great art it deals with and requires.

STARK YOUNG

Elegy in Sleep

“Who saw a white swan on the water?”

I, but it was the moon

A ghost behind clouds, and haunting there—

“Did she die so soon?”

Yes, she died. Upon the water

A stain of light, a small

Circle of white like a wedding-ring

Lies tranquil, and that is all.

VALENTINE ACKLAND

Citizen Welles

CITIZEN KANE” can be approached in several ways: as a film, as an event, as a topic of the times, etc. The outline of the story is simplicity itself, almost like saying, “Once upon a time there was a man of whom certain things are remembered.” But its presentation is managed in complex ways and its conclusions are so vague with the shadows of meaning that it is easy to read almost anything into it, including what was actually put there. The things to be said are that it is the boldest free-hand stroke in major screen production since Griffith and Bitzer were running wild to unshackle the camera; that it has the excitement of all surprises without stirring emotions much more enduring; and that in the line of the narrative film, as developed in all countries but most highly on the West Coast of America, it holds no great place.

The picture starts right in with the death of “Citizen Kane” alone with his crates of priceless art treasures in his fabulous castle on a mountain, where he has ruled for a time at least a miniature of the world. He said a thing when he died and the March of Time wants to make a story out of it, so we start combing the file of old acquaintance, with episode by episode told in flashbacks, and eventually we get the answer through the efforts of the inquiring reporter, who tracks down documents, the man’s oldest friend, his newspaper manager, the girl, the butler of the castle. Some of the points are made by the people questioned; some are made in what there is of story as it moves over the years from back to front; but the main point is that Citizen Kane wanted love from the world and went to most of his fantastic extremes to get it, yet never had any love of his own to give. And the thing the searchers have been after, the dying apostrophe which assumes the importance of a mystery-story clue in the last sequence, develops as no more than a memory of the self of his childhood.

There has been so much snarling and blowing on the subject of what this picture is about that it won’t hurt to clear the issue: most of the surface facts parallel incidents in the career of one W. R. Hearst; some traits are borrowed from other figures; some are pure ad-libbing. But any resemblance is distinctly coincidental; I could, and would if the editor were not afraid of libel, give you quite a list of Hearst’s undesirable characteristics not possessed by Kane. As for the importance of the figure as an element of society, I don’t think you can make that stick either. Kane started a war to get circulation for his paper; we hear in casual reference that he is a yellow journalist and we see in a three-for-a-nickel montage clip that he fought graft and some corrupt trusts; there is a prophecy, not followed up, that when the workingman becomes organized labor he will not love the workingman; he is interviewed by the press and makes wild statements with gravity; when anyone gets in his way he calls him an anarchist. Otherwise his troubles are personal, and his death is that of a domineering and lonely man, known to all for his money, loved by none. The only possible moral of the picture is, don’t be that way or you’ll be sorry.

Beyond the facts of the career there is the man himself, and this man is Orson Welles, young, older, middle-aged and in the last decrepit years, dominant throughout. Here perhaps, not so much spoken as expressed in the figure and

bearing, is the ruthless force, the self-will, the restless-acquisitive which we feel the story should express if it is to tell of these things at all. This man in these circumstances should be our twentieth-century brand of a figure out of Gustavus Myers: he did not roll up that fortune to start with, but he is no second generation gone to seed, for he turned the non-working capital into influence and public excitement and a sort of twisted splendor. It is as though Welles, as the man who conceived and produced this film story, had little enough grasp of the issues involved; but Welles as the actor somehow managed, by the genius that is in actors when they have it, to be more of the thing than he could realize. His presence in the picture is always a vital thing, an object of fascination to the beholder. In fact, without him the picture would have fallen all into its various component pieces of effect, allusion and display. He is the big part and no one will say he is not worth it.

Of his actors, you can say that there are good jobs done and also that there are better ones still to be done. Dorothy Comingore is forced to be too shrill as the shrill wife (the audience ear will absorb only so much) and too ham as the opera singer (subtlety never hurt anyone, and those of us who aren't gaping yokels are not alone, Mr. Orson Citizen). Joseph Cotten had a part that was possibly short on savor because when he was with the great man he had to be something of a chump and when he was talking of him afterwards he had to be something of a Mr. Chips, with twinkle and lip-smacking. Ray Collins did a good piece of work with a stock part, and so did all the other stock parts; but to me the man to remember was Everett Sloane, who seemed to understand and seemed to represent it, the little man with the big mind, the projection without the face motion and flapping of arms. You may be surprised when you take the film apart, and find that his relations to any analysis of Kane were as much as anything else the things that made him real.

Now I believe we can look at the picture, and of course we have been told to wait for that. The picture. The new art. The camera unbound. The picture is very exciting to anyone who gets excited about how things can be done in the movies; and the many places where it takes off like the Wright brothers should be credited to Welles first and his cameraman second (Herman J. Mankiewicz as writing collaborator should come in too). The Kubla Khan setting, the electioneering stage, the end of the rough-cut in the Marsh of Thyme projection room, the kid outside the window in the legacy scene, the opera stage, the dramatics of the review copy on opening night—the whole idea of a man in these attitudes must be credited to Welles himself.

And in these things there is no doubt the picture is dramatic. But what goes on between the dramatic high points, the story? No. What goes on is talk and more talk. And while the stage may stand for this, the movies don't. And where a cameraman like Gregg Toland can be every sort of help to a director, in showing him what will pick up, in getting this effect or that, in achieving some lifting trick the guy has thought up, the cameraman still can't teach him how to shoot and cut a picture, even if he knows how himself. It is a thing that takes years and practice to learn. And its main problem always is story, story, story—or, How can we do it to them so they don't know beforehand that it's being done? Low-key photography won't help, except in the case of critics. Crane shots and pan shots, funny angles like

showing the guy as though you were lying down at his feet, or moving in over him on the wings of an angel, won't help. Partial lighting won't help, or even blacking out a face or figure won't help, though it may keep people puzzled. Tricks and symbols never really come to much. The real art of movies concentrates on getting the right story and the right actors, the right kind of production and then smoothing everything out. And after that, in figuring how each idea can be made true, how each action can be made to happen, how you cut and reverse-camera and remake each minute of action, and run it into a line afterwards, like the motion in the ocean. Does this picture do this? See some future issue when I have the time to say it doesn't, quite. Right now I have to hurry to catch a boat back to New York.

OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

Kathleen Norris, the writer, assailed fears that Germany would attack the United States as "a bogey" and said:

"Hitler has been unable to cross even the Channel, which you will remember was once swum by an American girl." — *AP dispatch from Hartford to The New Britain (Conn.) Herald.*

Miss Hazel Huffman, another investigator, gave similar testimony and aroused protests from Mr. Voorhis when she said that she considered Communists and left-wingers to be identical. Representative Joe Starnes of Alabama, acting chairman, cautioned the investigator to use the term "left-winger" very carefully "because it has such a wide variety of meanings." Miss Huffman said she did not mean to include "genuine liberals or even idealists" under the term. — *From the hearings of the Dies Committee's investigation of alleged Communist domination in the APM, as reported in The New York Times.*

3-Inch Mountain Gun Is Small for Its Size. — *Caption on picture in PM.*

Progressive Education?

One afternoon, I received a group of winners in an essay contest from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. They were such bright-looking young people and evidently were enjoying their trip to Washington. Then we gave the annual tea for the graduating classes of the various schools. I think the group should be congratulated, for they came past me more rapidly than any other group that has ever been here. — *From Eleanor Roosevelt's "My Week," printed in The Elgin (Oregon) Recorder.*

Damn Clever, These Orientals!

Elderly Japanese general, houseworker, situation with bachelor, absolutely dependable. Isa, Plaza 3-6752. — *An advertisement in The New York Times.*

Cart-Before-the-Horse Department

In the past year, Finland has experienced a very acute political crisis—arising out of the problems of the disastrous adventure against the USSR. — *From The New Masses.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

A Communication

In Defense of the TWU

SIR: Your editorial, "The Subway Situation" (The New Republic, May 5), was one of the few articles that have appeared in the public press which treated the problem in a reasonable, forthright manner. There were, however, several errors of fact and interpretation in it.

Chief among these is the repeated suggestion that the TWU has talked strike and wants a strike on the subways in June. That is not true. The only statement that could be so construed was made by Mike Quill on March 21, at the meeting which ratified the bus-strike agreement. I was present at the meeting. I heard Mr. Quill say in reference to the Mayor, "He's an awful case, but I'm sure he is getting to know us and I'm sure we'll be on more friendly terms because of our action. I predict that we will keep up that action, because strike is the only thing they understand at City Hall from the Mayor down to the cat."

I admit that this is a hint of strike action. But remember the circumstances under which this statement was made—in the flush of the bus-strike victory. Remember, too, that at the same meeting, in the same speech, Mr. Quill also said: "When June 30 rolls around we'll take another trip to City Hall, in the hope that we find the Mayor in a better mood than he has been in the last few weeks. I'm not saying what will happen. I hope the sensible thing will happen."

In the evening of the same day Mr. Quill made another speech at a meeting of labor groups in the Hotel Edison. There he made clear the definitive position of the TWU: "There is no threat of a strike on the city's transit system and there will be no strike in June if the Mayor and the Board of Transportation are willing to sit down with us and do what they demand that private employers of labor do: bargain collectively with the union on wages and hours of the city's transit workers. . . . We humbly petition the Mayor—and ask him to stop, look and listen—to sit across the table with us. There is no threat of strike and there need be no strike."

What you will find in every TWU speech and leaflet is a plea for the solution of the subway problem in exactly the way you urge—"the patient and pragmatic adjustment of differences through the consulting of men none of whom wants trouble." When you call upon *both* Mayor LaGuardia and Mr. Quill "to stay within that tradition" you overlook the important fact that the TWU has requested and been denied the opportunity to meet with the Mayor.

The TWU wants to continue its contractual relations with the city-owned subways. The Mayor says "No." The TWU says, "Well, let's talk it over." The Mayor still says "No." That's exactly the set-up. Why then do you charge that the union's leaders have acted "as if they were more concerned with causing trouble for LaGuardia than getting basic gains for their members"?

The Transport Workers' Union was not built by causing trouble for individuals. Its very existence must be attributed to the fact that it has been concerned only with getting basic gains for its members—and it has succeeded to an extent that every sincere friend of labor must applaud.

May I supplement these comments with a few paragraphs from a memorandum which I have prepared for the use of the union?

Ever since the Board of Transportation, headed by John H. Delaney, became an employer of transit labor its policy has been ruthless dictatorship. This attitude was bluntly expressed by Chairman Delaney in a letter to Joseph B. English, then the legislative representative of the vast majority of the employees of the Independent Subway System, written on April 14, 1936. Said Mr. Delaney: "The interest of the employees of the Independent Subway System will be adequately protected by the Board of Transportation without your interference. There is no occasion whatever for your presence in Albany or elsewhere on such matters." English was threatened with dismissal.

This expression of contempt for the democratic process and the elementary rights of petition and representation is typical of numerous other deeds and utterances by Mr. Delaney and his fellow commissioners, Francis X. Sullivan and George Keegan.

The Board of Transportation and its apologists frequently assert that it does not wish to deal with the union of the employees' choosing because civil service takes care of management-labor relations.

Investigation shows that pay levels and working conditions vary in every city department, depending on the kind of organization the civil-service employees maintain. In the case of transit workers under the Board of Transportation, the three commissioners have sole right to fix wages, just like any private management. Neither state nor city law nor any elected officials have anything to say about working conditions on the IRT, BMT or IND.

President Philip Murray of the CIO states: "Civil-service laws have been enacted with the limited purpose in view of eliminating the spoils system from government employment; and no one has been more vigorous than organized labor in advocating the adoption and extended application of these laws. But they do not even scratch the surface of the complicated subject of labor relations. They deal only with the manner in which employees may be hired, promoted, demoted, discharged or laid off. As to wages, hours and working conditions, they say absolutely nothing."

Before unification, when the Board of Transportation operated only the Independent System, conditions there were worse and wages lower than on the privately owned IRT and BMT. In nine years of operation the board granted its employees only one general pay increase, despite the fact that the city-owned subways were opened during the depth of the depression, in 1932, with depression wages.

Since unification, when the Board of Transportation assumed control of all three systems, the board has cut wages, broken promises, unjustifiably dismissed employees, denied earned promotions, tampered with seniority rights, enmeshed the employees in a maze of "red tape" and has otherwise caused conditions to deteriorate. Seething discontent and unrest are rife among rank-and-file employees and even supervisory officials.

Enemies of the TWU insinuate that the union seeks to arrogate to itself the functions of the Civil Service Commission by demanding the right to dictate who shall be hired or fired.

The TWU has never sought and has never possessed the

right to hire employees, even under private management.

The only right the union has in this respect, and which it wishes to retain, is the right to represent its members when they have been denied justified promotions, when they have been unfairly disciplined or dismissed without just cause. The union has never condoned breach of discipline, incompetence or inefficiency. Whenever union officers and management fail to agree on a specific case, it is taken to an impartial arbitrator whose findings are final and binding.

The record shows that from 1937 to 1941 the subways and surface lines enjoyed the most peaceful and harmonious labor relations of any period since they were built. Collective-bargaining and adequate grievance machinery smoothed the most perplexing problems and settled the most irksome issues. In addition, the union contracts made the subways and other transit facilities safer and the lives of the employees happier by winning for them shorter hours, higher wages, paid vacations, holidays and sick-leave, and numerous improvements in working conditions.

The New York State Court of Appeals has held:

The city owns the subway, and it is a railroad corporation so far as the construction, operation and leasing thereof is concerned. . . . In other words, the subway is a business enterprise of the city, through which money may be made or lost, the same as if it were owned by an ordinary railroad corporation.

San Francisco, Seattle and Detroit own and operate the street-car lines. Their employees, who are on civil service, have signed contracts. The Tennessee Valley Authority has a signed contract with fifteen AFL unions. Employees of the railroad owned by the United States government in Panama, under civil service, have collective-bargaining rights. There are organizations in almost every New York City department. The firemen have an AFL union. The policemen have their organization. Through the efforts of these organizations the pay scales, the hours of work and retirement provisions have been improved.

Federal, state and city governments are constantly increasing their participation in industrial and business enterprises, and all signs point to more such activities in the future. If the employees in New York transit win the right to retain collective bargaining, industrial democracy will survive and flourish. If the Board of Transportation succeeds in subjugating its transit employees, then dictatorship will triumph in government business enterprises.

The TWU is a clean, effective, democratic and decent union. In addition to its primary function of getting better wages, shorter hours and improved working conditions for its members, it has promoted such other services as a medical plan, educational facilities, sports and recreation, credit unions, citizenship courses and other essential functions which make its members and their families better and happier Americans.

The public interest demands that the dispute between the Board of Transportation and its employees organized in the Transport Workers' Union be settled in a sane, just and practical manner.

New York City

LEO HUBERMAN

[Mr. Huberman, in our opinion, passes over too lightly the Wicks law, which seems to forbid the closed shop and strikes of more than five days' duration.—THE EDITORS]

Correspondence

We're in the Army Now

Following is the first instalment of letters The New Republic will print from time to time giving the impressions of trainees in the army camps. Readers should remember that they are first and not final opinions on experiences of army life.—THE EDITORS

SIR: Mr. Morris Markey in the Red Book Magazine of March, 1941, has written an interesting but highly inaccurate description of conditions at Fort Dix. His article seems to have been written in the comfort of the public-relations officer's headquarters, because so many of the fine features of army camp life he so vividly describes do not exist at Fort Dix. If readers were to take his description seriously, they would be clamoring to enlist in one of the most efficiently run health farms in the country.

To begin with, in discussing housing at Fort Dix he apologizes for the mud and the discomfort of the tents. He writes: "It was cold and there was ample mud, and some genuine discomfort." Then he adds that winterizing the tents, that is, boarding the walls to a height of five feet, made them "comfortable enough." Further, he states that the mud was defeated by duckboards and cinderpaths. There are more than 14,000 men here ready to disagree with him. For three months every man has taken a beating. It is a tribute to their stamina that the majority have stood up so well.

Official influence can be seen in the paragraph following his description of what he calls "past history." "By the time this article appears," he writes, "virtually all the men of Fort Dix will be in tight wooden barracks."

The article has appeared, and the only companies in barracks are one field-artillery outfit, one medical battalion and a corps of engineers. These men have been in barracks since their arrival at Fort Dix. They constitute less than 4,000 men. Fourteen thousand or more men of the infantry, the bulk of the service, are in tents and will stay there, since, according to their officers, they begin maneuvers so soon. The 852 barracks that he describes so glowingly are finished. They have been finished since the end of January. Their builders forgot one small item—roads. It has been discovered that in wet weather there would be such a mire about these structures that it would be virtually impossible to get men and machines in and out of the areas.

Undoubtedly Mr. Markey was shown through an artillery, medical or engineers' barracks. How he deduces from this Cook's tour that every soldier at Fort Dix is about to move into a similar structure is as mysterious as his assumption that the men eat out of chinaware and not mess-kits, which he learned were used only in the field and in emergencies. Fourteen thousand riflemen, the stalwart unfortunates of the tents, still eat from these aluminum kits. Another thing he forgot to notice was the prevalence of inadequate washing facilities for these articles.

Mr. Markey's reporting of the diet of the soldier was fairly accurate, but even here he failed to see the whole situation—the long waiting lines at the mess shacks, the aforementioned mess-gear, which mixes up the food into an unappetizing mess of meat, vegetables and dessert, all thrown together in one pan. His picture of sympathetic mess officers listening to complaints has reality only in the brain of a public-relations officer.

My point is this: Newspapers and magazines are reporting only half the truth. Much of what they fail to see would seem small compared to the whole task. But men are forced to live in an atmosphere of continual annoyance, badly served food, dirt,

mud, cold and disorganization, about which any buck private could write a steaming volume. It is bound to be cleared up in the future. Since this is a citizen army, the citizens deserve the whole truth about how their friends and brothers fare in it. Stop a man with crossed rifles on the lapel of his blouse. Pump him long enough and he will tell you this story. He will smile, too, if it is a warm spring day.

Fort Dix, N. J.

PRIVATE W. D.

SIR: I am a selectee stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. The boys in my company and regiment are from the New York area. The majority of them are volunteers. The most usual reason for their enlistment is unemployment. They volunteered with the idea: (1) that they might learn a trade, for most of them are unskilled; (2) that they would get away from oppressive conditions at home caused by unemployment; or (3) that they wanted to "get the year over with."

Nowhere is there even a whisper of a desire to "contribute to our defense effort." On the contrary, the boys in my camp positively jeer at the words "democracy" and "American way of life." They remember the slogans of the last war very well. They have seen "No Help Wanted" signs too often. They don't like Hitler, but they don't want to fight him, except, of course, if he comes over here. This is expressive of the failure of democracy to impress a love and awareness of its values and symbols upon us.

Speaking of democracy: My lieutenant was lecturing us on military courtesy, when one of the draftees asked whether we had to salute Negro officers, of whom there were many stationed nearby. He replied, "Whenevah ah see one, ah try to duck around a building, but once in a while ah cain't avoid them, so ah salute. Ah'd advise you to salute them too, but stay away from them as much as possible."

I know that the salvation of the progress we have made and will make depends upon England's ability to stand off and eventually defeat the Axis. No aid from the United States, to my mind, is too much to achieve this. But the values I hear praised are material ones: "What is democracy without a job?" The army's emphasis is completely on military discipline and efficiency. They take our attitude for granted. The only thought given to morale is to provide a ping-pong table, baseball games and B movies.

Fort Bragg, N. C.

PRIVATE S. F.

The Dangers of Coudertism

SIR: On May 2, Donald Ogden Stewart, Ella Winter, Ralph Roeder, Benjamin Appel, Henry Roth and Margaret Schlauch visited Mr. Ordway Tead, chairman of the Board of Higher Education, in the name of the League of American Writers. Purpose of the delegation was to bring before Mr. Tead the position of these writers concerning the suspension without pay of fourteen staff members of City College who have been named as Communists before the Rapp-Coudert Committee.

The action, which was permissive but by no means mandatory, appeared hasty and over severe to the delegation. It was based on allegations not yet tested by cross-examination of witnesses; it was taken *before* charges had been heard and answered before the Board; it entails suffering for the teachers and their families who find themselves abruptly deprived of modest incomes to meet current expenses.

A second action growing out of the first was protested by the delegation—the banning of all suspended persons from all meetings or gatherings on the campus. Mr. Tead claimed that this was done in the interests of public peace, since feeling is running high on the campuses. But the accused teachers have no means of communication at present with their former colleagues and students. Mr. Tead admitted that the daily press is not conspicuously fair or accurate in reporting controversial issues in general, and therefore might not be with the Coudert investi-

gation. This being the case, the delegation urged that the suspended teachers be readmitted to the only means of communication left—the use of the spoken word.

In addition, the writers stressed with considerable warmth the dangers implicit in the situation as a whole. The procedures of the Rapp-Coudert Committee have engendered an atmosphere of apprehension inimical to scholarly work. It is known that the committee has been questioning defendants about opinions, reading matter and theories ("What would you do if . . .?") which cannot possibly be called "activities" in any sense. Moreover, the resolution of the Board which introduces a political test for employment in the college is a danger. Although ostensibly limited to activity, not opinions, this test could be abused by interested parties and might, in times of tension like these, become an invitation for the preferment of charges on the basis of unsupported denunciation. The delegation urged that the Board take into consideration the abnormal tension of the times, and seek to diminish rather than increase the already deplorable anxieties and insecurity felt in the academic world.

New York City

MARGARET SCHLAUCH

Krock-Pot Journalism

SIR: In one of his hate pieces in The New York Times for May 20, Arthur Krock speaks of Secretary Wickard's preparing the way for a presidential visit to the Middle West. This, Mr. Krock says, "was probably an effective 'readying-up,' as they say in the Plains States."

I have lived in many parts of the Plains States without once hearing that expression. Could Mr. Krock have been thinking of the Pennsylvania Dutch expression "redding up"? This means straightening up, as in housework, and has nothing to do with preparing the way. I understand that in a certain krock-pot type of journalism words are sometimes put into people's mouths, and I wonder if Mr. Krock has done that in this instance.

New York City

J. PETERSON

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Robert Elder of Palo Alto, California, reminds us that labor has no monopoly on jurisdictional disputes, since religion, law, medicine and even journalism have had them. In labor, he says, they simply mean that "the inevitable struggle between progress and reaction is going on."

Thomas O Malley of Brooklyn believes, vehemently, that Dr. Francis E. McMahon had "no right, either under our own constitution or that of Ireland to address Mr. De Valera [The New Republic, May 22], a government official, publicly. . . . Private Reo M. Christenson, Camp Callan, San Diego, thinks economists have exaggerated the value of government borrowing from individuals, since citizens will let go of only surplus funds and not what they intend to spend for consumers' goods. . . . Manfred George sends us a December 6 copy of Aufbau, German-language refugee paper of which he is editor, containing an interview with Fritz von Unruh, who was the subject of a communication by Professor H. Steinhauer in our issue of May 12.

As a commentary on Michael Straight's article on euthanasia in Germany (The New Republic, May 5), a Chicago reader sends us a clipping from The Converted Catholic commenting on the reported closing of ten Benedictine monasteries in German-occupied territory, and evacuation orders given to six others. According to The Converted Catholic, this means a conflict "between the liberal Benedictines and the fascistic Jesuits. That Hitler is working hand-in-hand with the Jesuits is evidenced by the fact that Jesuitism's Catholic adversaries are suppressed. Hitler has not expelled a single Jesuit nor put one in a concentration camp nor accused one in an immorality trial. Such persecutions are reserved for the liberals. . . ."

The Means of Grace

CHRISTIANITY," wrote Nietzsche, "is a system, a view of things, consistently thought out and complete. If we break out of it a fundamental idea, the belief in God, we thereby break the whole in pieces. . . . If the English imagine they have no more need of Christianity as a guarantee of morality, that itself is merely the result of the ascendancy of Christian valuation; to such an extent that the strictly conditional character of English morality is no longer perceived. Morality is not as yet a problem for the English."

Dark as are these days, the Christian historian has cause to thank God for German thoroughness. For the past hundred years Occidental liberalism has lain snug in the belief that the relation of its arts and sciences, of its ethical and political values, to the Christian faith was simply historical. It has taken Hitler to show us that liberalism is not self-supporting.

Cultured people, to whom, until recently, theological terms were far more shocking than any of the four-letter words, are now in such danger and have seen so many of their absolute assumptions destroyed, that they may even overcome this final prudery; they cannot, those particularly whose childish memories associate religion with vague and pious verbiage, make a better start than by reading Reinhold Niebuhr's "The Nature and Destiny of Man" (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 306 pages. \$2.75).

Dr. Niebuhr is concerned with what the Puritans called "the ordinary means," *i. e.*, he leads the horse to the water, by contrasting its taste with that of blood and ink; whether the horse will drink or not, is of course not his business.

The common contemporary objections to Christianity are three: 1. The Psychological; that it denies the flesh in favor of the spirit. 2. The Political; that it enjoins acceptance of the status quo. 3. The Metaphysical; that belief in God is irrational and unscientific. With regard to the first two of these, Dr. Niebuhr shows that while Christians have often been guilty of both, neither is an orthodox attitude: the first is Platonic dualism, the second Stoic apathy.

The Christian faith is based on two revelations, the general revelation which it shares with all other religions, and a special revelation which is peculiar to itself, and on which its real claim to supremacy is founded. As a general revelation it can and should be examined by the methods of comparative anthropology.

To primitive peoples, scarcely conscious of the difference between man and the rest of created nature, whose overwhelming power also obliterates individual human differentiation, salvation is primarily the physical preservation of the tribe, and freedom little more than the privilege to be alive. Each specific danger has its specific Deity and is dealt with, like the traffic problem, by specific rules of conduct, the necessity for which is made reasonable by a myth. Thought and action, body and mind, immanence and transcendence are indistinguishable. Primitive man is too helpless and dependent for skepticism, but what, from the Christian standpoint, is lack of faith expresses itself as a faith in competing or malevolent deities. As control over natural forces improves, and the power of external necessity is lifted, it becomes clear, however, that the life of the individual and the life of his community are not identical and that freedom is not only the freedom to live, but the freedom to

live one of several possible lives. Leisure to speculate leads to the discovery that Man as a physical organism is obviously a finite and mortal individual, but that general ideas are apparently immortal and transcendent, and interrelated.

The higher religions are concerned therefore less with how man is to behave toward nature than how men are to behave toward one another; the main cause of anxiety now seems to be, not the possible malevolence of nature, but man's finiteness and social disunity.

Hence the tendency of the higher religions either to an ascetic dualism which regards matter as evil but unreal and attempts to ascend into the realm of pure ideas, or to a stoicism which regards matter as evil and real and counsels passivity. The emphasis of both on contemplation makes them highbrow, a-historic and anti-individual, stimulating inevitably their low-brow antithesis—a skepticism which accepts the passing moment and the desires of the finite individual as the only reality.

The historical evidence on which the claim of the Jews to be the chosen people is based is that they were able to arrive at faith in the righteous monotheism of the Higher Religions, without losing faith in the divine origin of matter which primitive religions have. Within their own community all men were equal individuals in the sight of God. Their defect lay in clinging to the primitive belief in Jehovah as their tribal property; in excluding the Gentile from religious equality, they were inferior to the Greek philosophers who welcomed all rational men.

The special Christian revelation, the Incarnation, occurred precisely at that moment in history when an impasse seemed to have been reached. The civilized world was now politically united, but its philosophical dualism divided both society and the individual personality horizontally, the wise from the ignorant, the Logos from the Flesh; the only people who did not do this were the Jews, but they divided society vertically, themselves from the rest of the world.

The significance of the doctrine of the Incarnation is twofold. In the first place it asserts that at an actual moment in historical time, the Word was actually made Flesh, the possibility of the union of the finite with the infinite made a fact. This is the element emphasized by Catholicism. Modern science so takes the unity of thought and action, body and mind for granted, that it forgets that none of the non-Christian cultures have been able intellectually to achieve it; when the naturalist and the romantic attack, quite rightly, dualistic corruptions of Christianity, they forget that it is only in Christendom that men have seen dualism as something to attack. It is unfortunately true that, if the Jews once crucified Jesus physically, the Church has again and again crucified Christ intellectually, but at the same time it has itself provided the insight to realize this.

The second and, since for civilization as a whole the intellectual battle against Hellenic dualism is now pretty well won, the more important significance of the Incarnation is as an answer to the problem, not of "the finiteness of man but of his sin, not his involvement in the flux of nature but his abortive efforts to escape that flux. The issue of Biblical religion is not primarily the problem of how finite man can know God but how sinful man is to be reconciled to God and how history is to overcome the tragic consequences of its false eternals. . . . The content of the revelation is an act of reconciliation in which the sin of man becomes the more

sharply revealed by the knowledge that God is Himself the victim of man's sin and pride. Nevertheless the final word is not one of judgment but of mercy and forgiveness."

The most brilliant chapters of Dr. Niebuhr's book are those dealing with the Christian conception of sin:

Sin is occasioned precisely by the fact that man refuses to admit his "creatureliness"; he pretends to be more than he is. . . . Man is not divided against himself so that the essential man can be extricated from the non-essential. Man contradicts himself within the terms of his true essence. His essence is free self-determination. His sin is the wrong use of his freedom and its consequent destruction . . . man is a finite spirit lacking identity with the whole, but yet a spirit capable in some sense of envisaging the whole so that he easily commits the error of imagining himself the whole which he envisages . . . the sin is never the mere ignorance of his ignorance. It is always, partly, an effort to obscure his blindness by overestimating the degree of his sight.

The necessary precondition, the temptation to sin, is what the psychologist calls anxiety, and the Christian calls lack of faith. No Christian doctrine is more unwelcome to the modern liberal than the doctrine of Original Sin. The Church is not altogether blameless for this hostility because it has sometimes spoken of the Fall as if it were a literal historical event, as if each man's sin was related to Adam's

sin in terms of seminal identity, instead of its being "a symbol of an aspect of every historical moment in the life of Man. . . . Perfection before the Fall is, in other words, perfection before the act," though act must here be taken to include thought.

As a Protestant, Dr. Niebuhr's theology is Augustinian, *i. e.*, he rejects the Catholic version of the Fall in which original justice only is destroyed but natural justice is still uncorrupted, and I agree that modern psychology and sociology confirm the Augustinian position and render the Catholic theory of natural law ultimately untenable, admirable though it seems in practice when compared with evangelical perfectionism.

Both Catholicism and Protestantism agree in maintaining that only faith in the Incarnation can conquer man's original anxiety; their differences lie in emphasis. The Catholic emphasizes the initial act of intellectual assent, the Protestant the continuous process of voluntary assent. The former is therefore always in danger of identifying the eternal with some particular historical social form; the latter is always in danger of ignoring the concrete realities of a historical situation altogether. "The Nature and Destiny of Man" is the most lucid and balanced statement of orthodox Protestantism that we are likely to see for a long time.

W. H. AUDEN

Books in Review

Punishment and Crime

ARTHUR KOESTLER, an exile from Germany, was for some time the Ullstein correspondent in Moscow and the friend of Russian officials who died in the purge. He has been thinking about the reasons for their fate and for the betrayal of the revolution—or was it betrayed after all? Is it perhaps fulfilling the destiny marked out for it? "Darkness at Noon,"¹ the book that grew out of these meditations, is the first serious novel to deal with the Moscow trials, and it is a better beginning than Mr. Koestler or his readers had any right to expect.

Its hero is Nicholas Salmanovich Rubashov, former member of the Central Committee, former People's Commissar, former head of the Aluminum Trust, now a prisoner in Cell 404 of the Lubyanka. The story begins with his arrest and continues through the secret hearings, the confession, the public trial—an inevitable sequence leading to his execution. The few minor characters are skillfully portrayed. Cell 402 is occupied by a Monarchist officer, never seen, who taps messages through the wall about his erotic daydreams and his primitive standards of honor. The old professor in Cell 406 is a revolutionist who had spent twenty years in a prison on the other side of the border; released, he had taken the first train for Moscow, only to be re-arrested two weeks later. He now takes comfort in the delusion that he isn't in Russia at all, that his enemies had made him take the wrong train; and meanwhile he taps on the

wall, letter by letter, *ARIE YE CHILDREN OF STARVATION*, always omitting the "s" in "arise." The two examining magistrates are typical in different ways of the new officialdom. Ivanov is tired and cynical but kind-hearted; he wants to make Rubashov confess in order to save his life. Gletkin is a fanatic who makes Rubashov confess and sends him to his death for the greater glory of the regime.

But why did the government insist on these confessions? Mr. Koestler believes that the purge and the trials had two motives behind them: first, to get rid of any dangerous or potentially dangerous officials; second, to provide scapegoats and make the masses believe that Stalin's enemies were responsible for all the failures of the dictatorship. Why then did the prisoners confess, when they had committed very few of the crimes about which they almost boasted? Why didn't they repudiate their confessions when they appeared in court? Mr. Koestler thinks that several explanations must be advanced, since each case was handled separately by the examining magistrates. "Some were silenced by physical fear . . . some hoped to save their heads; others at least to save their wives or sons from the clutches of the Gletkins. The best of them kept silent in order to do a last service to the Party, by letting themselves be sacrificed as scapegoats—and besides, even the best had each an Arlova on his conscience. . . . They were all guilty, although not of those deeds of which they accused themselves."

As a political document, the book is not particularly impressive. Mr. Koestler is repeating explanations that others have given already, though he repeats them at greater length and with more psychological subtlety and depth. He fails

¹ *Darkness at Noon*, by Arthur Koestler. Translated by Daphne Hardy. New York: The Macmillan Company. 267 pages. \$2.50.

to consider a possibility for which there is at least circumstantial evidence, that an actual plot against Stalin came close to being successful. Moreover, he makes the worse mistake—from the novelist's point of view—of using statistical arguments. Rubashov says to one of the examiners, "We deliberately let die of starvation about five million farmers and their families in one year. . . . We sent about ten million people to do forced labor in the Arctic regions and the jungles of the East. . . . In the interests of the coming generations, we have laid such terrible privations on the present one that its average span of life is shortened by a quarter." These assertions may or may not be factually true; I have seen no trustworthy figures to support or disprove them. The first seems dubious, considering that "about" five million farmers and their families would be equal to "about" the entire population of the Ukraine, which is still thickly settled. But in any case, Rubashov in making these assertions seems to be speaking out of character; and they are unnecessary from the standpoint of the author, since he is trying not to treat human beings as arithmetical units. From the ethical point of view that he elsewhere adopts, the famine in the Ukraine would still have been unpardonable if only five thousand farmers had been deliberately let die of starvation, or only five hundred.

His novel is best when it is moral and personal rather than political. It is best when it tells the story, not of Russia as a collectivity, but of a Russian individual who was punished for crimes he never committed while admitting to himself that he was guilty of other crimes, and who in punishment found a sort of freedom or even salvation. From this point of view, "Darkness at Noon" bears a curious resemblance to "Native Son," a book that sets out to express quite the opposite political opinions.

Rubashov had always worked selflessly to create a new civilization free from war and poverty and injustice. But in so doing, he had often committed acts of black injustice against individuals, believing as he did that any acts were morally right if they helped to produce a better society. Now, in his prison, he could not logically complain that the individual Rubashov was being treated unjustly. By logic Stalin was correct, having pursued to the very end the path along which his victims had already taken many steps. And that is the reason why Rubashov was unable to resist the arguments of the two examining magistrates. They represented the Government and the Party, which in turn represented right thinking and the future.

But meanwhile another voice kept telling him that the officials of the Government and the Party might be wholly mistaken, that by treating people merely as tools they were becoming monsters of heartlessness, that by sacrificing individuals to the future they were creating a future in which no individual would wish to live. Rubashov had acted in a similar fashion; his real guilt was that he had sacrificed his friends and even his mistress Arlova on Party orders or—the voice whispered—merely to save himself. This voice to which he listened more and more was the voice of the "I" that he had once dismissed as a grammatical fiction; now at last it was directing his actions. And the meaning of the novel seems to be that Rubashov, like Bigger Thomas, discovered his own personality by accepting the justice of his fate, so that it was a man and not an arithmetical unit that died in the cellars of the Lubyanka.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Medicine for the Million

Germes and the Man, by Justina Hill. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 475 pages. \$3.75.

Plague on Us, by Geddes Smith. New York: The Commonwealth Fund. 365 pages. \$3.

A History of Medicine, by Arturo Castiglioni. Translated from the Italian and edited by E. B. Krumphaar. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1,081 pages. \$8.50.

OFTEN a popular writer on medicine will act like a doctor prescribing a bitter pill. To help the reader take the dose of solid, wholesome fact, he tries to sugar-coat it with elegant prose or dilute it with gossip. Unless handled with the utmost skill, these tactics may backfire and the reader be not instructed but distracted. An example of this type of misguided helpfulness is "Germes and the Man." Such coy chapter titles as "The Wily Streptococcus and Its Brother, the Pneumococcus" and "Sword Swallowing, or Drugs Taken by Mouth," are examples from a text that abounds in fancifulness.

It would have been a good book if a capable editor had been able to work on it. The material is all there—an up-to-the-minute survey of our present knowledge of infection, and of what the human body, with or without the aid of drugs, does to fight infection. If the reader is not allergic to awkward writing, he will enjoy a wealth of material on the techniques of bacteriology and on such new disease weapons as the sulfa-family of specifics and Dubos' germ-killing extracts from the soil.

Evidence that this type of story *can* be told straight, and with the utmost interest, is given by Geddes Smith's remarkable book, "Plague on Us." Mr. Smith has used the hard way of making his subject palatable—not by dodging technicalities, not by dressing them prettily, but by thinking through them to the underlying simple questions that doctors try to answer in their complicated research. Such technical terms as the author must use are clearly explained and there are numerous illustrative anecdotes.

But this book is more than a clear and well written summary of medicine's ways of fighting yellow fever, malaria, plague and the baffling influenza-cold complex. It is also a critical evaluation of what medicine has failed to do. Much of our public-health progress, Mr. Smith points out, has been progress in the dark. And in many respects we are still in the dark—about the inner mechanics of immunization, for example, or the trick that parasites have of evolving or adapting to circumvent man's defenses. For all our chemistry, we do not know the structure of viruses and toxins, nor of many of the preparations we use against them.

With such fundamentals unsolved, Mr. Smith marvels that we are as healthy as we are. "The human race," he concludes, "has had a generous allowance of what looks like blind luck in dealing with its parasites." Even today he is able to warn that "the world is in peril of pestilence. It is early to boast." Here is a critique that will challenge the attention of the medical profession as well as its clientele's.

Both of these books, and all popular books of such a general type, gain much of their perspective and interest from references to medical history. Future writers on the subject will be helped enormously by being able to use

Castiglioni's monumental history, just translated from the Italian into English. The new edition comes in a big and handsomely printed volume, with many illustrations from ancient and medieval practice. It will take its place on the reference shelves alongside Fielding Garrison's history as one of the major sourcebooks in the field. If the Castiglioni text is stiffer and less readable than Garrison's, the thoroughness of the scholarship—especially apparent in the pre-modern period—is ample compensation.

HARRY M. DAVIS

Refugees—Screen Version

Flotsam, by Erich Maria Remarque. Translated from the German by Denver Lindley. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 436 pages. \$2.50.

EVER SINCE "All Quiet on the Western Front" Mr. Remarque has employed the same method of writing. By reproducing facts in effective fiction he has tried to reflect in very compact situations the big issues he was concerned about. In "All Quiet" the end to which he used these effects was obvious; in his present novel the issues are not clear, or at least not clear enough for Mr. Remarque to make the book the great plea it could have been.

There is, however, a certain parallel between Mr. Remarque's first novel and his latest, for again he deals with one of the indignities of our time. He writes of the first victims of barbarism, the outcasts from their homeland, the refugees who, without passports, are being driven back and forth between borders. His characters are Jewish and non-Jewish, young and old, and their life is one of fear and despair, flight, arrest and deportation. There is no doubt as to the accuracy of his portrayal of these characters who drag their uprooted existences from one country to another, only to be gradually broken down by the modern monster of nationalism. And Mr. Remarque's description of how they keep on living—or rather, keep from starving—is most convincing. The very monotony and repetition in their destinies is part of the reality and not just a weakness in the conception of the novel.

Yet this true recording, realistic and compelling as it is, does not in itself seem to aim at anything. It does not even make a story. And as the author is vague as regards the end he has in view, he chooses to build up a work that leaves the reader with the uncomfortable feeling of having been taken in by descriptive effects. This feeling is strengthened by instances of artificiality and sentimentality—such as the refugee Steiner's return to Germany where his wife is dying, and his inevitable arrest by the Gestapo; the suicide of a Jewish girl in Paris and the highly fictional act of mercy that precedes it; and the generous German whom the two lovers meet in Prague just at the time when they need him.

"Flotsam" was serialized and made into a movie before its publication as a book. Perhaps this accounts for much of the melodrama; in fact, one has the feeling that Mr. Remarque might very well have written the great novel which the powerful and tragic theme suggests, had he not subjected himself to the rules of the screen.

KLAUS LAMBRECHT

Animal Kingdom

Wildlife Conservation, by Ira N. Gabrielson. New York: The Macmillan Company. 265 pages, illustrated. \$3.50.

DR. GABRIELSON'S WORK reads a good deal like a textbook intended for college courses and addressed to an audience familiar with general zoölogy and accustomed to the special jargon of biological science. Readers who approach it without that background are going to have rather hard sledding, but even at that they ought to find the attempt worth while. The wild creatures of America have always been of great importance to the economic and social well-being of the people as a whole. We all know that there are, and have been for many years, state and federal agencies whose function is the management of wildlife; they aim to encourage the increase of those creatures useful to humanity, and to discourage harmful varieties, but to prevent the absolute extermination of even the most objectionable pests.

It's a tricky business, this conservation of wild birds and animals, calling for a sound knowledge of biology, a broad and humane viewpoint, great patience and infinite pains. As Dr. Gabrielson abundantly shows, it is intimately tied in with the matter of land uses in general. You cannot have bison by the million roaming ranges that have been fenced and plowed and planted to wheat. You cannot have wild ducks breeding abundantly in Canada if all the sloughs and resting-places along their American migration-routes have been drained. But you can preserve or restore the marsh areas, and the ducks will come back. You can build up the Nevada antelope herd if you keep down predators and prevent hunting. You can even, as in the case of the Pennsylvania deer, develop a herd so large that there is grave danger of winter starvation; and when that condition comes about, you can rectify it by lengthening the hunting season, raising the bag limit, or—as Pennsylvania has recently done—by declaring an open season on does. Sentimental nature-lovers raised an awful fuss about that, but it was sound conservation just the same.

The point is that a given land area will support only a given number of animals, and of only a few sorts. You have to handle it like a farm, taking off what annual crop you can but being sure to leave enough seed stock for another year's harvest. But, unlike the individual farmer, you have to think of each piece of land in relation to all the rest of the land in the country. You have to think of the crop not in terms of what's in it for you, but of what's in it for the people as a whole. And your program for wildlife must dovetail with programs for soil conservation, water-power control, forest usage and public recreation.

That Dr. Gabrielson does think in such terms is evident on every page of his book, and we may well be thankful that such a man heads the national Fish and Wildlife Service. Barring a certain skimpiness in its treatment of fisheries problems, his book is excellent within the limits inherent in such a semi-technical work; and any nature-lover, hunter, Audubon Societeer or social planner should find it of interest and value. The seventy-seven photographs are ordinary and add little to the text, but the twenty-four charts and diagrams are most helpful.

J. R. DE LA TORRE BUENO JR.

Hands in Imperfect Order

The Airmen, by Selden Rodman. New York: Random House. 148 pages. \$2.

MR. SELDEN RODMAN has taken up, in "The Airmen," a subject that has already intrigued such American poets as Muriel Rukeyser and William Rose Benét. Airmen are, of course, terribly timely. While you read this, several are undoubtedly engaged in potting innocents with high-explosive bombs. Mr. Rodman, being a poet, deplors this practice. His concern is with Man Soaring Toward the Empyrean, Man Rising from This Penfold Here, etc. In spite of what one may feel about his subject—I sometimes, especially in these last two years, picture the Wrights as a couple of grubby Pandoras, box and all—one realizes that aviators are well on their way to being kingpins of a new mythology, and that every poem about them deserves careful consideration. And careful study, too, for it usually turns out to be propaganda.

At the moment one has a perfect right to question the value of the plane. It does, true enough, get that tanned banker back from Miami in a shorter period of time, and it's handy to fly serum around, but it is, above all, a terrible thing of ruin on land and sea. We have learned to fly in the air, and we have learned also not only a new way of killing people but how to make a simply lovely mess while doing it. Perhaps that Mussolini whose bombs burst like roses is the archetype of the aviator.

Mr. Rodman, however, while viewing with alarm as a poet, points with pride as an airman to the fact that now we can do everything a seagull (or shrike) can. His new work, which is by way of being a history of the air, is divided into four main parts, separated by a series of short odes. He is concerned with Daedalus and Icarus, Leonardo da Vinci, the Wrights and Lauro de Bosis, in that order. The gaps in this arrangement are obvious: that Mr. Rodman's results are unsuccessful is due in about equal measure to his method and his talent. "The Airmen" is really a paean to science, and I am not sure that poetry and science are on the best of terms. I dislike very much the way Mr. Rodman treats Daedulus and Icarus. Myths were invented for moral purposes, and the poetry to be derived from Icarus' fall is of a purely moral nature. The fall might illustrate any number of things, such as pride or ambition, but certainly not what Mr. Rodman would have us believe. He has warped the myth most mercilessly in making pseudo-history out of it. He is most satisfactory when he is concerned with the merely scientific, as in the section on the Wrights. There, for a while, he's on solid, though unpoetic, ground; but immediately afterwards he slips back into the Slough of Mystic Air with Lauro de Bosis, who looks like duck soup to become a cult any day now.

The poem, in the last analysis, doesn't jell. It's the old college try, that's all. Mr. Rodman is an excellent eclectic, but he isn't a very good poet. He is readable, but readability is not necessarily the test of art. He is tolerably clever (or at least *unique*) at construction, but not clever enough to keep "The Airmen" from moving in jerks. The history of his subject is, unfortunately for him, as long and as difficult of comprehension as the air is of access. Its history is long, yes, and full of fine names, and yet one can't help

feeling that a long poem on aviation is a little premature. The dead children and the bombed towns shouldn't be left out of it. It is as though Homer had ended the "Iliad" before the Greek ships landed at Troy, or as though Milton had finished "Paradise Lost" before the fall of Satan. Which is not meant to imply that there is any connection between Homer, Milton and Mr. Selden Rodman.

HARRY BROWN

A Reader's List

THE HABIT OF EMPIRE, by Paul Horgan (Harpers, \$2). An incident in the conquest of New Mexico by the Spaniards. A brief narrative that describes in magnificent, controlled prose the successful assault on an Indian pueblo situated on an almost inaccessible mesa. Horgan's descriptive passages are stunning, but he seems to have been bitten by the wave-of-the-future interpretation of history.

ZACHARY TAYLOR, SOLDIER OF THE REPUBLIC, by Holman Hamilton (Bobbs-Merrill, \$3.50). "Old Rough and Ready" was probably the most poorly equipped man ever to attain the presidency. This sympathetic and uncritical first volume of a two-volume biography documents the life of the plodding career soldier through the Mexican War. How the politicians eased him into the White House will come later. So far, a conscientious but pedestrian job that simply ignores the stirring times and issues through which Taylor vegetated. The bibliography is valuable.

McGILLYCUDDY AGENT, by Julia B. McGillicuddy (Stanford University Press, \$3). Sketchy, casual biography of a famous Indian agent by a too admiring wife. McGillicuddy ran the important Pine Ridge Agency in Dakota Territory

ACCENT

A Quarterly of New Literature

PRESENTS IN ITS SUMMER ISSUE (Vol. I, No. 4)

John Dos Passos....*The Very Slaughter of the Witnesses*
Wallace Stevens.....*The Nexus and the Weather*
Edwin Berry Burgum.....*Into the Night:*
Proust's Account of the Fall of French Civilization
Doris Benardete.....*The Golden Harp*
Joy Davidman.....*Trojan Women*
Walter V. T. Clark
Why Don't You Look Where You're Going

Other fiction, poetry, and criticism by W. T. Scott, Harry Roskolenko, J. V. Healy, S. I. Hayakawa, and Josephine Miles—and

AMERICAN POETRY: 1930-1940

A bibliography compiled by the editors with the help of R. P. Blackmur, Horace Gregory, John Holmes, and M. D. Zabel—surveying notable books of poetry and about poetry in the last decade, with information about publisher, price, present availability, outstanding reviews, etc. Arranged by years to show the amazing increase in poetic activity in the 1930's. An invaluable guide to the development of modern verse.

The three previous issues of Volume I (with new work by Porter, Gregory, Weldman, Ransom, Farrell, Ferguson, Aiken, Daiches, Herbst, Arvin, and sixty others, including many young writers of distinction) may still be ordered with the Summer issue.....all for \$1.00

ACCENT: 102 University Station, Urbana, Illinois.

Enclosed find ☐ \$1.00 for 1 year beginning.....
☐ \$1.75 for 2 years beginning.....
☐ 30c for a sample copy

Send to.....

Address.....

.....

during the critical eighties when the defeated Sioux were in the first stages of "pacification." Interesting chiefly as further, but fragmentary, evidence of the betrayals through treachery and treaty-breaking which brought the new order to the Great Plains Indians.

THE DIARY OF GINO SPERANZA: Italy, 1915-1919, edited by Florence Colgate Speranza (Columbia, \$6). An American's well written personal and political impressions of Italy during a critical period. Speranza went to Italy as war correspondent for The New York Evening Post and The Outlook and served for a time in the American Embassy at Rome. Many charming passages, and also data on Italo-American relations.

THE GERMAN ELECTIONS OF 1907, by George Dunlap Crothers (Columbia, \$3). A scholarly and persuasive demonstration of the great importance of Germany's elections in 1907, revealing the marked direction of the country's national sentiment toward imperialism and *Weltpolitik*. Much detailed information on political parties and on the popular support of a powerful army and navy and of an aggressive and imperialist foreign policy.

THE GREAT CENTURY, A.D. 1800-A.D. 1914, by Kenneth Scott Latourette (Harpers, \$3.50). The fourth volume in the author's monumental "History of the Expansion of Christianity" deals with its remarkable expansion in Europe and, particularly, in the United States. Special emphasis is laid on the frontier, immigrants, Indians, Negroes, and the interplay of Christianity and our changing environment. This extremely readable and informative volume may be read independently of the other volumes in the series.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR, DIPLOMACY AND PEACE, 1914-1919, by Austin Van Der Slice (Pennsylvania, \$4). A scholarly and exhaustive study of labor's peace program during the First World War and at the Paris Peace Conference, confined to investigation of French, British and American labor movements, stressing the relationship of their war and peace aims to those of Wilson, and giving due attention to socialist and trade-union internationals.

SPRING 1940, by Stuart David Engstrand (Doubleday, Doran, \$2.50). This story of a young Nazi's betrayal of his Norwegian family pretty well projects in capsule the Nazi betrayal of Norway. The guileless Norwegian hospitality,

the isolated bits of treachery, the mounting horror, the resignation that has no choice—all these, and more, are here. The writing is awkward but the background is sound and the lesson is unmistakable.

FIRST, THE FIELDS, by Charles Wood (Chapel Hill, \$2.50). Decline and fall of a prosperous tobacco farmer in North Carolina, a conscientious, able fellow who loses the acres he loved excessively and the wife he loved moderately. Some spotty writing but a clear feeling for the land and those who live by and for it.

Contributors

JULIAN HUXLEY, who is a contributing editor of The New Republic, is an English biologist and writer, the author of many books on scientific and general subjects.

WILLSON W. WHITMAN is a newspaper woman. Her family has lived for four generations in the second congressional district of Texas, the Dies district.

MAX GISSEN, a frequent contributor to The New Republic, has been making a study of the excess-profits-tax problem.

VALENTINE ACKLAND, an English poet, lives in a village frequently visited by German raiders. She is co-author, with Sylvia Townsend Warner, of a book of verse, "Whether a Dove or a Seagull."

LEO HUBERMAN is a columnist on national affairs for US Week. His most recent book, "The Great Bus Strike," has just come off the press.

W. H. AUDEN is the well known English playwright and poet, now living in this country.

HARRY M. DAVIS, of the New York Times staff, is at present studying science and medicine at Harvard under a Nieman Fellowship.

KLAUS LAMBRECHT, writer and literary critic, has worked in France as correspondent for Swiss newspapers. He has also translated a number of American best-sellers into German for Swiss publication.

J. R. DE LA TORRE BUENO JR., who is publicity director for Alfred A. Knopf, was formerly a trout culturist for the New York State Conservation Department and editor of Fish Culture, its monthly technical publication.

HARRY BROWN is one of the editors of Vice Versa, together with Dunstan Thompson, and is the author of "The End of a Decade," published by New Directions.

MILTON

in THE PURITAN REVOLUTION

By DON M. WOLFE

A dynamic new interpretation of Milton's place in history—his social ideals, political, economic, educational, religious, oriented with those of Lilburne, Overton, Walwyn, Winstanley, Williams, Cromwell. An indispensable handbook to the social thought of the Puritan Revolution. \$4.00 List Price

Thomas Nelson and Sons

New York, N. Y.

THEATRE

BEST PLAY OF THE YEAR!

Vote these Members
of the Critics' Circle

SAROYAN'S

NEW COMEDY

"THE BEAUTIFUL PEOPLE"

LYCEUM Theatre, 45 St. E. of B'way. CH 4-4256

Eves, Incl. Sun., 8:50. Mats. Wed. & Sat. 55c to \$2.20.

STARK YOUNG
GEORGEJEANNATHAN
JOHN ANDERSON
GRENVILLE VERNON
JOSEPHWOOD KRUTCH
JOHN MASON BROWN

BUNGALOWS

BUNGALOW COLONY

In Mountains of nearby New Jersey, 45 minutes from New York. Swimming, all sports, social hall, day camp, commuting, gas, electric. From \$150. Route 29 to Plainfield (26 miles from Holland Tunnel), right at Shell Gas, 3 miles to Old Sterling Road.

Mrs. R. Gopan, Warrenville, N. J. Plainfield 6-9734

FOR SALE

ACRE OR MORE for Year-Round Retreat, Longview, Peaceful Hilltop, Highest Character, Lowest Cost. Defeat Inflation. Rick, Peekskill, N. Y.

SUMMER RENTALS

SPACIOUS, PEACEFUL HILLTOP, three rooms, bath, furnished, all conveniences, commuting, low rental to small quiet family. Rick, Peekskill, N. Y.

FURNISHED from June 15 to Oct. 1, three-room apartment, bath, garage, suitable for one or two adults. References. Box 228, Great Neck, N. Y.

5-ROOM HOUSE, near Peekskill, well furnished, modern equipment, cultivated ground. Children's day camp, sports facilities. June 27 to Sept. 1. Phone 9 to 2, Stillwell 4-8090, or write Schwartz, 4310 57th Street, Woodside, Long Island.

COTTAGES WANTED

WANTED for summer: 5 or 6-room house, within commuting distance of N. Y. City, Long Island or Westchester. Give full particulars. Address: Box 275, New Republic.

LANGUAGES

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. We sell, rent, purchase, exchange. All Makes. 20 different sets in French alone. Mail Orders. Request Booklet R. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

LITERARY HELP

TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. **AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU**, 516 Fifth Ave., New York.

WEARING APPAREL

BECAUSE WE CLOSE June 28th for entire summer, every lovely model dress, suit and coat is offered at absolute clearance. Within the next month consult with us regarding vacation clothes problem. Miss Goodman, 474 Seventh Avenue (at 36th St.). LA 4-4013.